The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Danubian Principality of Wallachia

James Richard Morris
Emmanuel College, Cambridge

September 2019
This dissertation is submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit of 80,000 words.

James Richard Morris

The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Danubian Principality of Wallachia

James Richard Morris

Abstract

This thesis uses the Wallachian Revolution of 1848 as a window through which to see and study questions about time, revolution, national and European identity, personal and popular sovereignty, and the relationship between central and local interests in mid-nineteenth-century Europe. It argues that liberal intellectuals in the two Danubian Principalities thought about their national pasts and futures in European terms during the 1840s and re-imagined the idea of Europe from the periphery. It was only with the outbreak of revolution across Europe in 1848 that they began to think of changing the present. Popular sovereignty lay at the heart of the revolutionary programme. Opportunities to participate in national politics were opened to rural and urban populations alike, and these changes mirrored those across the continent during the revolutionary year. The history of Southeastern Europe should not be viewed as divorced from that of the rest of Europe. Debates on peasant emancipation and land mirrored those about the right to work in France, and both were connected to ideas of political sovereignty. To be sovereign as a whole, the people needed to be sovereign as individuals, which meant they needed the means to sustain themselves. In a city like Paris this meant they needed the right to work. In the agrarian context of rural Wallachia it meant they needed land. But while the general European revolution spurred the Wallachians to act, it also hindered their chance of success. The grand unified revolution broke apart, and counterrevolutionary forces picked them off one by one. A joint Ottoman-Russian occupation followed for Wallachia. The revolutionaries had attempted to Europeanise the principality. They took local concerns and transformed them into national debates. The counterrevolutionaries reversed these trends. They provincialised the principality, imposed new state apparatuses of control, and divided local grievances from national politics. It was not a return to the pre-revolutionary order. It was the creation of a new order that could preserve something of the character of the pre-revolutionary era while responding to the changing needs and circumstances of Wallachia.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor—Christopher Clark—and advisor—Joachim Whaley—for their invaluable thoughts and feedback and also Felix Waldmann, who read and commented upon several sections of the thesis. The organisers and attendees of the Modern European Workshop at Cambridge, *Les Mondes du 1848* Conference in Paris, and Centre for History and Economics Workshop also offered helpful thoughts on sections of two chapters.

This research would not have been possible without the generous financial support of the Pigott Family, and so thanks both to them and all the administrators at Cambridge who organised and oversaw my studentship. Financial support was also provided by the Centre for History and Economics and Emmanuel College, and so thanks to Inga Huld Markan and everybody at the Centre as well as the Master and Fellows of Emmanuel College.

Thanks is also due to the librarians, archivists, and cloakroom attendants of the National Archives at Kew, the Diplomatic Archives in Nantes, the National Archives, National Library, and Academy Archives in Bucharest, and everyone at Cambridge University Library and the British Library who fetched an array of Romanian books that had never been borrowed or looked at before. Special thanks are due to Zoë Hitzig, Susanne Schmidt, and Felix Waldmann, who photographed printed material that I was unable to access in the UK and neglected to look at during my travels. Those who painstakingly digitised so many books for Google Books and the Bucharest and Cluj Digital Libraries also deserve thanks for making so much material more readily available, and I would also like to thank those scholars who gathered and published so many archival documents, as well as the many scholars whose works I cite.

Cristina Arhip provided me with accommodation in Bucharest and lent a sympathetic ear on the tougher days in the archives. Without Anna Borca and the staff at the Romanian Cultural Institute in Bucharest I would never have been in a position to write this thesis, and so I thank her and her team for teaching me Romanian while I was living in Bucharest in 2015/16 before embarking on my doctoral research.

Everyone at M60 in Bucharest, Hot Numbers in Cambridge, and St. David's Coffee House in London also deserve thanks for keeping my caffeine levels up.

For keeping me sane during the process of researching and writing this thesis, I would like to thank my friends Ollie Burch, Tom Parry-Jones, Zoë Hitzig, Susanne Schmidt, Stephanie Troyak, Daphnis Kokkinos, Caitlin Doherty, and many more. Each provided emotional and intellectual support when needed, and I cannot value their contributions highly enough.

My final thanks go to Ilinca Radulian, who supported me through three years of talking about Wallachian history and offered advice on translation, my parents, and anybody else whose contribution I have foolishly forgotten. Please accost me if you find yourself reading this thesis and wondering where your thanks went. I will gladly add them in pencil.

All errors are—naturally—my own.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

On 24 February 1848, the people of Paris threw open the gates of the Tuileries Palace. They climbed its grand staircase and stormed the magnificent apartments of King Louis-Philippe. The walls were lined with paintings, and every hearth was laid so that a fire could be lit at any moment. One burned still, and the king's breakfast table was laid and ready, suggesting that the royal family had not long since fled. The intruders sat down and enjoyed the king's breakfast. Looking around at the splendour of the king's rooms, one workman of the city was reported to have cried 'Well! Indeed this is a better house than mine.'[1] Others tore velvet draperies and curtains down from the walls. Men and boys wrapped themselves in the expensive shawls of the princesses and pranced through the palace and out into the streets.[2] The greatest prize was the king's throne. Men, women, and children took turns to sit in his place. They mimicked his mannerisms and bounced on the plush cushioned seat. Once everybody had had his or her turn, the throne was picked up and passed from hand to hand across the room to be thrown out the window. 'Good Lord,' cried one observer of the scene in Gustave Flaubert's *L'Éducation Sentiemntale,* 'Look how it's pitching! The ship of state is being tossed on a stormy sea! It's doing the cancan!'[3] Four men extricated the broken throne from the flowerbeds below. A crowd gathered around them, and together they processed along the *Rue de Rivoli,* through *Le Marais,* and along the *Rue Saint-Antoine,* like a funeral cortège. The parade ended at the *Place de la Bastille,* where the crowd set light to the throne and watched it burn. But at least one piece survived the fire. A young Wallachian student, Nicolae Bălcescu, had cut a scrap of velvet from the throne when he took his turn on the seat, and later in the afternoon of 24 February he slipped it into an envelope with a letter to his Moldavian friend Vasile Alecsandri. 'I am so tired,' wrote Bălcescu. 'For the last three days I have lived in the streets. The great nation has risen and redeemed the liberty of the world. This marvellous revolution…will change the face of the world.' He included the velvet to show Alecsandri that 'even in the greatest and most solemn moment in my life, my thoughts turned to you…Long Live the Republic! Brotherhood and Hope!'[4]

---

[1] Percy B. St. John, *French Revolution of 1848. The Three Days of February 1848*, (London: Richard Bentley, 1848), second edition, 243-247.
[2] Fanny Lewald, Hanna Ballin Lewis ed. & trans., *A Year of Revolutions: Fanny Lewald's Recollections of 1848*, (Oxford: Berghahn, 1997), 48.
[3] Gustave Flaubert, trans. Robert Baldick, *Sentimental Education,* (London: Penguin, 2004), 313. Original French: « Saprelotte ! comme il chaloupe ! Le vaisseau de l'Etat est ballotté sur une mer orageuse ! Cancane-t-il ! cancane-t-il ! »
[4] Nicolae Bălcescu to Vasile Alecsandri, 24 February 1848, in Nicolae Bălcescu, G. Zane ed., *Opere*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne, 1964-1986), 4 vols, vol. IV, 86. '…sunt ostenit de tare, de

The experience of the revolution of 1848 was nothing like that of its great predecessor of 1789. Bystanders and participants alike understood the historical significance of events. A revolutionary template existed, whereas in 1789—in the words of Peter Fritzsche—'history had taken contemporaries by surprise.'[5] The people of the late eighteenth century had no point of reference for the cataclysmic events that unfolded around them. The people of 1848 could look back to the first French Revolution for inspiration and guidance. They burnt the king's throne on the same site where their predecessors had laid siege to the Bastille, that great symbol of *Ancien Régime* tyranny. But revolution wasn't confined to Paris or France in 1848. The French Revolution of 1789 was exported by war, traversing the continent at the point of Napoleonic bayonets. In 1848, as Jonathan Sperber observed, 'revolution spread from one country to the next by force of example, not by force of arms.'[6] The peoples of Europe rose for themselves, and perhaps Bălcescu's optimism stemmed from the fact that they had already begun to rise before 24 February. In a contemporaneous speech to the Society of Romanian Students in Paris, his countryman Dumitru Brătianu spoke of events across the continent. He pointed to Switzerland, the Italian peninsula, Bohemia, Styria, and Croatia. 'Today,' Brătianu said, 'all of mankind enters into a struggle that was unknown in past times.'[7] It was a struggle that both he and Bălcescu understood in European terms.

Historians have long debated the European nature of the revolution(s) of 1848. Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann wondered to what extent it made sense to write of a 'European revolution' when 'only four major countries—France, Germany, the Habsburg empire, and Italy—were directly involved.' His use of the term 'countries' is problematic enough. Neither a German nor an Italian state existed in 1848, and the Habsburg Empire could be said to contain more than one 'country'. Other states were only 'strongly affected' by the events in Paris, Vienna, Berlin, and Rome.[8] A recent volume on *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought* shares von Strandmann's focus. Five of the eighteen essays treat

---

vreme ce de trei zile trăit-am tot pe ulițe. Află că națiа cea mare s'a ridicat, și că libertatea lumei s'a mântuit. Minunata revoluție….va schimba fața lumei…chiar în minutele cele mai mari și mai solenele ce am petrecut în viața mea, cugetarea mea s'a întors către tine…Să trăiască Republica… Frăție și speranță!'

[5] Peter Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present, Modern Time and the Melancholy of History*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 31.

[6] Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848-1849*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) second edition, 265.

[7] Brătianu's speech was published by C.A. Rosetti during the summer in *Pruncul Român.* He dates it to late 1847, but many of the events to which Brătianu refers didn't take place until January 1848. For the full text of the speech see Ioan C. Brătianu, ed., *Anul 1848 în Principatele Române, Acte și Documente publicate cu ajutorul Comitetului pentru Rădicarea Monumentului*, (Bucharest: Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl, 1902-1910), 6 vols., vol I, 61-73. 'astăzi…omenirea întreagă intră într'o frămîntare necunoscută vremilor trecute!'

[8] Von Strandmann, Hartmut Pogge, '1848-1849: A European Revolution?' in R.J.W Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds, *The Revolutions in Europe 1848-1849: From Reform to Reaction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 1-8, 2.

French subjects, another five discuss the revolution and its legacy in the German states, and the single attempt at cross-border comparison is limited to France, Germany, and Great Britain.[9] Events beyond what is sometimes called 'old Europe' and at other times 'core Europe' get little look in.[10] Jonathan Sperber described the absence of any 'serious revolutionary challenge to existing authority in Britain and Russia' as 'more significant' than the upheavals in the smaller states of Europe.[11] Miles Taylor has offered a corrective to this interpretation of British history. The British mainland may not have experienced revolutionary upheaval, but this stability was not 'matched by peace and quiet across the empire.' Unrest hit Britain's European holdings in Malta and the Ionian Islands, and it affected more distant territories including Ceylon and Canada.[12] Nor is it entirely true that Russia faced no revolutionary challenge to its authority. There was no uprising within Russia itself, but the empire was implicated in the Wallachian Revolution by virtue of the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, which established a Russian protectorate over the Danubian Principalities. This detail often goes unmentioned in accounts of the revolutions. David Saunders, for instance, refers to the Danubian Principalities once in his essay on the Russian Empire in 1848, and then only in the context of the costs to the Russian exchequer of intervention in Wallachia and Hungary.[13] The Ottoman Empire remains almost completely neglected. Sperber refers to it only in passing, and Mike Rapport doesn't even include it in the index to his book, although it is mentioned in a few places.[14]

Debates about revolutionary simultaneity and interconnectivity date back as far as the revolutions themselves. An attendee at a popular assembly in Mannheim in February 1848 declared that 'one idea flashes through Europe [and] the old system shakes and falls into

[9] The other essays cover Britain (x2), Belgium, the Habsburg Empire (x2), Italy, and the 'Slav Question'. See Douglas Moggach & Gareth Stedman Jones eds, *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
[10] On the use of these terms, see Holly Case, 'Being European: East and West', in Jeffrey T. Checkel & Peter J. Katzenstein eds., *European Identity,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 111-131.
[11] Sperber, *The European Revolutions,* 260-261.
[12] Miles Taylor, 'The 1848 Revolutions and the British Empire', *Past & Present* 166 (2000), 146-180.
[13] David Saunders, 'A Pyrrhic Victory: The Russian Empire in 1848', in R.J.W Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds, *The Revolutions in Europe 1848-1849: From Reform to Reaction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 135-156, 144.
[14] See, for instance, Mike Rapport, *1848: Year of Revolution*, (London: Abacus, 2009), 236. 'Bakunin criticised the [Slav] congress for focusing primarily on the Austrian Slavs, and so ignoring the plight of those who lived under the Ottoman and Russian empires.' The absence of the Ottoman Empire from general discussions of 1848 likely stems from the near-total absence of secondary literature on the subject. Banu Turnaoğlu is currently working on an article to address this silence, and Alp Yücel Kaya gave a talk on Balkan peasants and landowners under Ottoman domination at a conference on *Les Mondes de 1848* between UPEC, Paris 13, and EHESS in Paris in December 2018.

pieces.'[15] Advertisements for a republican popular meeting on 3 April in Berlin announced that speeches in honour of the 'great European revolution' would be given in German, French, and English.[16] Writing in exile in Paris in September 1850, Nicolae Bălcescu described the general revolution as 'the occasion, not the cause of the Wallachian Revolution.'[17] More recently, Rapport described the revolutions as 'genuinely spontaneous across the continent,' whereas von Strandmann suggested that the revolution in Paris 'galvanized' movements elsewhere, and Robert Evans argued that after 1789 France became 'the touchpaper for future international explosions.'[18] Discussions of the links between revolutionary theatres centre on what Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Dieter Langewiesche referred to as the 'Europeanisation of information' from the late-eighteenth century onwards.[19] For Reinhart Koselleck, the new roads, railways, and telegraph networks of the period constituted an 'unbroken network of communication which helped to link the single uprisings like a system of communicating tubes.'[20] Claus-Møller Jørgensen suggested that this communicative network was a 'transurban phenomenon.' He wrote that 'with the exception of France, there were more similarities with respect to the revolutionary activities and agendas in different urban settings across Europe, than between rural and urban settings within the same state.'[21]

Revolutionary simultaneity was undoubtedly a feature of 1848, but it needs to be complicated. The new informational networks of the early nineteenth century were nothing like as quick as the Internet. Prince Metternich resigned as Chancellor of the Austrian Empire on 13 March, but *Le Constitutionnel* in Paris didn't carry the story until a week later, and the news didn't appear in the Wallachian press until 27 March.[22] Telegraphy was not nearly as

---

[15] Quoted in Axel Körner, 'The European Dimension in the Ideas of 1848 and the Nationalization of its Memories', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 3-28, 15.
[16] Quoted in von Standmann, 'A European Revolution?', 3-4.
[17] Nicolae Bălcescu, 'Mersul Revoluției în Istoria Românilor,' reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere*, II, 107-113, 107. 'Revoluția generală fu ocazia, iar nu cauza revoluției române.'
[18] Rapport, *Year of Revolution,* 410; von Strandmann, 'A European Revolution?', 5; R.J.W. Evans, 'Liberalism, Nationalism, and the Coming of the Revolution', in R.J.W Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds, *The Revolutions in Europe 1848-1849: From Reform to Reaction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 9-26, 9.
[19] Heinz-Gerhard Haupt & Dieter Langewiesche, 'The European Revolution of 1848: Its Political and Social Reforms, its Politics of Nationalism, and its Short- and Long-Term Consequences', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds., trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 1-23, 3.
[20] Reinhart Koselleck, 'How European Was the Revolution of 1848/49?' , in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 209-221, 212-213.
[21] Claus Møller Jørgensen, 'Transurban interconnectivities: an essay on the interpretation of the revolutions of 1848', *European Review of History - Revue européenne d'histoire*, 19.2, (2012), 201-227, 215.
[22] *Le Constitutionnel,* 20 March 1848; *Curierul Românesc*, 15 March 1848. Wallachia still used the Julian Calendar in 1848, which at the time was twelve days behind the Gregorian Calendar in use in the rest of Europe. All dates

common as Koselleck's argument would have it. There were few electric telegraph lines in Europe at the time, and those that did exist were monopolised by the state. A study of telegraphy in Europe published in Paris in 1869 described the technology as 'one of the prerogatives of the Crown' under the July Monarchy. It was only in November 1849 that 'an act was passed by the legislature which admitted the public to share in common with the Government the privilege of using the telegraph,' and it was in response to disturbances in 1848 that the Prussian state built one of its first telegraph lines connecting Berlin to Frankfurt am Main.[23] Information might have been Europeanised, but that development owed as much to the revolutions as the revolutions did to the new technology. Revolutionary simultaneity needs to be reconsidered in this light. The 'communicating tubes' that Koselleck described were often blocked, and information didn't travel freely and accurately. Rumours played their part in the course of revolutionary events, and simultaneities were often imperfect. In a 1932 essay, the German Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch wrote that 'not all people exist in the same now,' and the same could be said for the revolutions of 1848. This is not to suggest—as Bloch does of those of 'peasant descent'—that some places in Europe were of an 'earlier type,' although many Eastern Europeans had assimilated Enlightenment ideas of their own backwardness, but rather that revolutionary hopes in one theatre sometimes coincided with the death of hopes in others.[24] These imperfect synchronicities were particularly apparent and significant in the Wallachian case. Revolution struck Bucharest on 23 June, the same day that the announcement was made in Paris that the *Ateliers Nationaux* would close, and the June Days began. The Wallachian revolutionaries still believed in the promise of the Springtime of Peoples, but that promise had been overtaken by other concerns in several of the European revolutionary theatres. As John Breuilly put it, 'from about April 1848 connections weakened in so far as they were based on ideological perceptions rather than directly linked interests and institutions.'[25]

---

will be given in the Gregorian Calendar to avoid confusion and help situate events in Wallachia in the broader European context.

[23] George Sauer, *The Telegraph in Europe. A Complete Statement of the Rise and Progress of Telegraphy in Europe, Showing the Cost of Construction and Working Expenses of Telegraphic Communications in the Principal Countries etc. etc.,* (Paris, 1869), 9-10; Jean-Michel Johnston, 'The Time and the Place to Network: Werner Siemens during the Era of Prussian Industrialization, 1835-1846', *Central European History* 50 (2017), 160-183, 182.

[24] Ernst Bloch, trans. Mark Ritter, 'Nonsynchronism and the Obligation to its Dialectics', *New German Critique* 11 (1977), 22-38, 22; on the Enlightenment and the development of the idea of Eastern European backwardness, see Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment,* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994).

[25] John Breuilly, '1848: Connected or Comparable Revolutions', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 31-49, 34.

But the significance of the idea of Europe should not be dismissed. Mike Rapport described the 'cosmopolitan language' of the revolutionaries as 'largely empty rhetoric' and suggested that 'talk of Europe and of international fraternity was all too much.'[26] Europe may have been—as Axel Körner put it—'an idea without a concrete programme behind it' in 1848, but that didn't weaken the power of the idea.[27] Revolutionaries across the continent appealed to the idea of Europe in their rhetoric, and they mobilised it to serve personal and national political objectives. In July, the Wallachian Princely Lieutenancy that was established with Ottoman approval earlier that month addressed a proclamation to the principality's wealthy boyars (noblemen) who had fled abroad during a cholera outbreak in May. It urged them to return to Bucharest 'so that we can show to all Europe, which has its eyes upon us, that in all of Wallachia there isn't a single person who didn't participate actively in the resurrection of the Wallachian nation.'[28] A landowning delegate to the Wallachian Property Commission, which was established to decide upon the distribution of land to the peasants, used a similar argument a month later. He told his peers that 'the whole of Europe has turned its attention toward us, and we await its sympathy and help,' but that help would not be forthcoming when Europe saw that 'our peaceful and common revolution…begins its work with the abolition of the right of property and the breakdown of human society.'[29] The idea of Europe interacted with specific concerns, and historians need to grapple with those relationships. As Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimermann have suggested, 'the transnational cannot simply be considered as a supplementary level of analysis to be added to the local, regional, and national levels according to a logic of a change in focus.' Instead it needs to be treated as 'a level that exists in interaction with the others, producing its own logics with feedback effects upon other space-structuring logics.'[30] National and European ideals were not necessarily in conflict with one another. To be European was—as Holly Case put it—'a constituent element of national identity.'[31]

---

[26] Rapport, *Year of Revolution,* 412-413.
[27] Axel Körner, 'The European Dimension in the Ideas of 1848 and the Nationalization of its Memories', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 3-28, 16.
[28] Biblioteca Acadamiei Române (BAR), Manuscrise Românești, 3862, 10r. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 603-604. '…casă putem arăta europi întregi, care are ochii pe noi, că în toată rumâniei na rămas un singur om carele nu a luat parte activă la această înviere a Neamului rumânesc.'
[29] *Anul 1848,* III, 363. 'Europa întreagă, domnilor, care astăzi și-a întors căutăturile sale către noi, și de la care așteptăm simpatii și ajutoare, Europea întreagă, vă zic, domnilor, ne-ar privi cu groază și cu ură, când ar afla că pacinica și obștească revoluție ce s'a săvîrșit pe malurile unui rîu ce o interesează a început lucrările sale prin desființarea dreptului proprietății, prin desorganisarea societății omenesci!'
[30] Michael Werner & Bénédicte Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity,' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 30-50, 43.
[31] Case, 'Being European', 111.

Historians have tried to untangle the knotty social and political questions that animated revolutionary actors during 1848, but they would do better to rig their sails with those knots. The year 1848 was 'clumsy' and 'untidy,' according to Martin Swales, who suggested that it had 'something to do with the fact there were simply too many issues at stake at any one time.'[32] Wolfgang Höpken wrote that the social and national questions 'moved like two currents, which for a time flow together, but which, however, can flow apart again.' In the same essay he suggested that the agrarian question in Southeastern Europe gave the revolutions there a 'totally different social dimension' to those in France and the German states.[33] Historians should embrace the messiness of 1848 and consider what it means that all of these ideas came together at once. Giovanna Proccacci described the right to work and to support as the 'social equivalent of the franchise,' but they were more than that.[34] The right to work and the right to vote were not equivalents. They were connected. Revolutionary proclamations were issued across Europe in the name of the sovereign people, but in order to be sovereign the people needed to be sovereign over themselves, which meant they needed to be self-sufficient. In cities like Paris, the right to work offered that opportunity. For the agrarian economies of Southeastern Europe, access to land was more important. Both fell under the broader heading of the 'Social Question,' and as Holly Case has shown, 'questions' during the nineteenth century were often bundled together 'so that it seemed impossible to solve one without addressing the other(s).'[35] The 'Europeanisation of information,' to use Haupt and Langewiesche's term, was connected to the socialisation of national questions and the Europeanisation of social ones. In the same essay they wrote that 'the constitution served as the instrument for approaching the ideal of equality of all citizens,' and that all social groups in 1848 saw 'an uptick in politicisation.'[36] The equality of all citizens was not only a question of political rights for many. It was a social question too, and growing political awareness meant the nationalisation and Europeanisation of social groups. Grievances that had once been local concerns became national and even European ones. The Springtime of

---

[32] Martin Swales, 'Events and Non-Events… Cultural Reflections of and on 1848', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 50-63, 59.

[33] Wolfgang Höpken, 'The Agrarian Question in Southeastern Europe During the Revolution of 1848/49', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds., trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 443-471, 455 & 443.

[34] Giovanna Proccacci, 'To Survive the Revolution or to Anticipate it? Governmental Strategies in the Course of the Crisis of 1848', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds., trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 507-527, 510.

[35] Holly Case, *The Age of Questions Or, A First Attempt at an Aggregate History of the Eastern, Social, Woman, American, Jewish Polish, Bullion, Tuberculosis, and Many Other Questions over the Nineteenth Century, and Beyond,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018), 6.

[36] Haupt, 'European Revolution,' 4 & 8.

Peoples, then, was not only the Springtime of Peoples as nations, but also of Peoples as the masses.

Most accounts of the Wallachian Revolution exist in a sphere detached from the broader debates about the European 1848.[37] Instead these works treat events as part of the story of how Moldavia and Wallachia—and later Transylvania—united to become Romania, and they carry titles that emphasise national unification as a revolutionary objective.[38] Foreign influence is sidelined or rejected. The story of 1848, suggested Dan Berindei, was the story of 'one of the great moments of the historical affirmation of the Romanians,' and part of an 'inexorable historical development.'[39] Gheorghe Platon traced the origins of the revolution back as far as the sixteenth-century Wallachian Prince Michael the Brave. The revolution, he argued, was the product of the social and national programme outlined, underlined, and affirmed over the course of earlier struggles. He identified several long-term 'revolutions' that led to 1848 and argued the political revolution was the product of changes in demography, agriculture, industry, and ideology.[40] But none of these were discussed with any reference to European events. The tendency to see the events of 1848 in the light of the unification of the two Danubian Principalities in 1859 and union with Transylvania in 1918 goes beyond the Romanian national school of history. The former director of political studies at the American Council on Foreign Relations, John Coert Campbell, wrote his doctoral dissertation on 'French Influence and the Rise of Roumanian Nationalism,' but his discussion of both nationalism and the revolution never moves beyond the 'patriotic agitation' stage of Miroslav Hroch's theory of national development.[41] The Wallachian people have little part to play in

---

[37] There are a few exceptions. See, for instance, Gheorghe Platon, 'L'Europe et la révolution roumaine de 1848', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXVII (1998), 73-88 and Florian Roateș, 'Interferențe europene în gîndiriea istorică Românească de la 1848', *Revista Istorică*, I (1990), 73-82.

[38] See, for instance, Cornelia Bodea, *Lupta românilor pentru unitatea națională, 1834-1849*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1967), which is also available in translation as Cornelia Bodea, trans. Liliana Teodoreanu, *The Romanians' Struggle for unification 1834-1849*, (Bucharest: Pub. House of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, 1970). Other books that treat the revolutions across present-day Romania in concert with one another include Apostol Stan, *Revoluția română de la 1848: solidaritate și unitate națională*, (Bucharest: Editura politică, 1987), Apostol Stan, 'Unitatea națională prin legături între cărturari în anii anteriori revoluției de la 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 41 (1988), 386-403, Apostol Stan, 'L'unité nationale chez les Roumains en 1848: idée et action politiques', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXII (1993), 15-33, and G.D. Iscru, *Revoluția română din 1848-1849,* (Bucharest: Casa de Editură și Librărie N. Bălcescu, 1997).

[39] Dan Berindei, *Revoluția Română din 1848-1849: considerații și reflexii,* (Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 1997), 41. 'unul dintre marile momente ale afirmării istorice a românilor…indrumare ale unei dezvoltări istorice inexorabile'

[40] Gheorghe Platon, *Geneza revoluției Române de la 1848: introducere in istoria moderna a României,* (Iași: Editura Junimea, 1980.

[41] Campbell's thesis was published thirty-one years after he received his doctorate from Harvard by the Arno Press. See John C. Campbell, *French Influence and the Rise of Roumanian Nationalism*, (New York: Arno Press, 1971). The chapter on 1848 is headed 'The Imported Revolution,' and it probably does the best job of situating the revolution in its European context, but Campbell still devotes too much attention to the place of the revolution

Campbell's narrative of nationalism, and the concentration on revolutionary leaders is perhaps one of the reasons why historians have been so willing to see a simple connection between 1848 and 1859. Many of the revolutionaries would go on to play prominent roles in the unification of Moldavia and Wallachia, but instead of approaching 1848 as an 'apprenticeship'—as Maurice Agulhon does in his study of the French Second Republic—Romanian historians backdate the concerns of 1859 to 1848.[42] Cornelia Bodea, for instance, suggested that an article from the Wallachian newspaper *Popolul Suveran* that described a united Romania as 'not yet an actual and serious political consideration' was a coded message that meant the opposite.[43] The Islaz Proclamation, which became the principality's constitution during the revolution, spoke of a nation of seven million people, but this idea never moved beyond theory, and federalist ideas were explored just as much as ones of national unification. Other works on the revolution have served more personal ends. Dan Pleshoyano, for instance, criticised the liberal and socialist historians of the revolutions for being 'really no better than courtesans' in their fawning over the Brătianu brothers and Nicolae Bălcescu. He preferred to write about another figure from the revolutionary era: his ancestor Nicolae Pleșoianu.[44] Berindei reviewed Pleshoyano's book for the *European History Quarterly* in 1993. He described it as a 'thorough and praiseworthy biography of one of the personalities whose activity marked the process whereby modern Romania was created.'[45]

Despite the shortcomings of the existing historiography, the Wallachian Revolution has much to offer to the historian of 1848 and Europe more generally. Keith Hitchins described it—after Lewis Namier—as a 'revolution of the intellectuals,' but the principality had no universities and only a few secondary schools.[46] Literacy rates were low, and there were only a handful of printing presses in the Wallachian capital.[47] The revolutionary leaders might

---

within the Romanian story, and he treats it alongside events in neighbouring Moldavia. The same is true of Lothar Maier's essay on the subject. See Lothar Maier, 'The Revolution of 1848 in Moldavia and Wallachia', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds., trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 186-209. For Miroslav Hroch, see Miroslav Hroch, trans. Ben Fowkes, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 1-30. Hroch's rigid characterisation of national movements does not map neatly onto the Romanian case, with both the 'period of scholarly interest' and the 'period of patriotic agitation' coexisting throughout the nineteenth century.

[42] See Maurice Agulhon, trans. Janet Lloyd, *The Republican Experiment, 1848-1852,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[43] Bodea, *Lupta românilor*, 170. 'Regatul daco-român nu era încă o considerație de politică reală și serioasă.'

[44] Dan V. Pleshoyano, trans. Kathe Lieber, *Colonel Nicolae Pleșoianu and the National Regeneration Movement in Walachia*, (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1991), viii.

[45] Dan Berindei, 'Review of Dan V. Pleshoyano, *Colonel Nicolae Pleșoianu and the National Regeneration Movement in Walachia*,' *European History Quarterly* 23 (1993), 300-301.

[46] Keith Hitchins, *The Romanians, 1774-1866*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 250.

[47] No formal surveys of literacy in the principality exist for the early nineteenth century, but Alex Drace-Francis puts the figure well below that of Western Europe. Rural illiteracy stood at 85 percent in 1899, meaning that

have studied in Paris, Geneva, and Berlin, but the thousands of people who participated in meetings in Bucharest and swore oaths to the new constitution had little formal schooling. Popular revolutionary participation needs to be reconsidered. The revolution was not an intellectual experience, but a social and cultural one. Mack Holt argued that religion during the French Wars of Religion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries should be defined in terms of 'a body of believers rather than the more modern definition of a body of beliefs,' and revolution in the mid-nineteenth century should be seen in a similar light.[48] It united people and peoples. Popular revolutionary involvement was grounded as much in a sense of community as it was in an ideological framework, as the testimonies of many of the people who were brought before the commission that investigated revolutionary participants in the aftermath of the Wallachian Revolution showed. People attended meetings with family and friends, and revolutionary government agents and propagandists attempted to embed the new order in daily life. Approaching the revolution(s) of 1848 in this light illuminates the development of popular politics during the period. Wolfgang Höpken argued that the Serbian- and Romanian-speaking peasants of the revolutions were not interested in national demands. If these appeared in their petitions, he suggested, then they were 'placed in their mouths by leaders of the national movements.'[49] His analysis of peasant psyches is difficult to disprove, but it would be better to consider what it meant that peasants often articulated specific local grievances in the language of national politics. The revolution harmonised these ideas by making them part of day-to-day social and cultural life. Tricolour flags weren't just visible on government buildings in Bucharest. They flew above village churches, too. The revolution created new spaces for popular politics, but it also appropriated old ones in the same way that the French Revolution of 1789 had done.[50] The same was true of ideas. John Coert Campbell's description of an 'imported revolution' is misleading. It wasn't a finished product that revolutionary leaders brought back from Paris. Vlad Georgescu has shown how Enlightenment ideas were reconceptualised to fit the circumstances of the Danubian Principalities, and the same approach needs to be adopted for 1848.[51] The Wallachian

---

fewer people could read in the United Principalities in 1900 than could in some regions of Western Europe in the mid-sixteenth century. See Alex Drace-Francis, *The Making of Modern Romanian Culture: Literacy and the Development of National Identity*, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), 40-45.

[48] Mack P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), second edition, 2.

[49] Höpken, 'The Agrarian Question', 462.

[50] For a brief discussion, see P.M. Jones, *Reform and Revolution in France: The Politics of Transition, 1774-1791,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 226-236.

[51] See Vlad Georgescu, *Political Ideas and the Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities, 1750-1830*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971).

Property Commission, for instance, was modelled on Louis Blanc's Luxembourg Commission, which was formed to discuss social and economic reforms. Ideas, practices, and institutions travelled, and they adapted and interacted with autochthonous ones to form new modes of quotidian life. The Wallachian Revolution offers a striking example of how that process took place in the context of an agrarian economy that was culturally, intellectually, and socially distant from Paris, Vienna, and Berlin.

The counterrevolution in Wallachia has been almost completely ignored by historians, but it played an important role in the broader course of counterrevolution in Europe and illustrates how post-revolutionary governments tried to inoculate society against a future revolution.[52] Jonathan Sperber considered the counterrevolution in Wallachia, which was driven by a joint Ottoman-Russian occupation, to be insignificant in comparison with other counterrevolutionary responses in Europe. Roger Price has recognised the international character of the European counterrevolution. French, Austrian, and Neapolitan soldiers all joined forces to put down the Roman Republic in 1849, and Austrian and Russian forces did the same to the Hungarian Revolution.[53] The suppression of the Hungarian Revolution was made possible by the counterrevolution in Wallachia. It gave the Russian soldiers a base of operations for attacks on neighbouring Transylvania, and it allowed the Austrians to outflank their opponents by crossing the principality.

Counterrevolution—like the revolution itself—was a wave that swept across Europe, and as it did so it sought to divide individual causes. Sabine Freitag suggested that the failure of the revolutions 'may itself have caused nationalism increasingly to overshadow constitutionalism.'[54] This fragmentation was part of the counterrevolution. Revolutionary leaders fled into exile, and contact with their homelands was limited by new state apparatuses of control. Tighter censorship laws and stricter border controls were introduced in Wallachia to limit the flow of information from abroad, and land reform was pursued to restore local grievances to the local rather than national sphere.[55] It was a policy designed to break the

---

[52] Barbara Jelavich's work is an exception. See Barbara Jelavich, *Russia and the Formation of the Romanian National State, 1821-1878*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and Barbara Jelavich, 'The Russian Intervention in Wallachia and Transylvania, September 1848 to March 1849', *Rumanian Studies: An International Annual of Humanities and Social Sciences* IV (1979), 16-74.

[53] Roger Price, 'The Holy Struggle Against Anarchy" The Development of Counter-Revolution in 1848', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds., trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 25-54.

[54] Sabine Freitag, 'National Union or Cosmopolitan Unity? Republican Discourse and the Instrumental Approach towards the German Question', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 106-123, 118.

[55] Jonathan Sperber described the abolition of serfdom as the 'most significant and never altered consequence of the revolution,' but this is not entirely true in the Wallachian case. The Islaz Proclamation promised the

connections that had formed during the revolution and maintain order through improvement. Revolution, as Christopher Clark has shown, was replaced by a 'technocratic vision of progress.'[56]

By reintegrating the Wallachian Revolution into the broader story of 1848, this thesis offers new perspectives on time, revolution, liberalism, nationalism, and the idea of Europe itself in the mid-nineteenth century. The first chapter engages with debates about the past and future of the Danubian Principalities. It argues that both Moldavians and Wallachians accepted Enlightenment ideas of Eastern European backwardness, but that these were historically specific and connected to the principalities' isolation from Europe during the eighteenth century. Both lands had once formed part of the European cultural sphere, and to do so again they needed to learn from their Western European peers and implement similar improvements to provide for a brighter future. The revolution changed this approach. It forced the Wallachians to consider the present and engage with the political changes taking place across the continent. Chapter two examines how the European revolutions were received, adopted, and adapted in Bucharest. It shows how the revolutionary government attempted to embed itself within the machinery of state, and how the people of the city participated in revolutionary cultural practices. Chapter three then moves out to other Wallachian towns and the countryside. It challenges Jørgensen's idea of revolutionary connections between cities being greater than those between cities and their hinterlands and demonstrates how new and existing social ties were used to spread the revolutionary cause. Peasants became national actors and pursued their own ends within the framework of the revolution. In doing so, they challenged the new order and threatened its stability. The fourth chapter moves out to situate the Wallachian Revolution in its international context through a study of revolutionary diplomacy. It argues that Wallachian envoys struggled against the changed atmosphere of the continent and failed to recognise that the promise of spring no longer held sway during summer. It was only after the revolution fell in September that the exiled revolutionaries began to approach foreign policy as a geopolitical rather than ideological question. The fifth and final chapter covers the neglected period after the Ottoman occupation of Bucharest of 25 September. It shows how new means of control were imposed, revolutionaries were rounded up and punished, and reforms were pursued to mitigate future struggles. The revolution had brought the future into the present and united

abolition of serfdom, but the revolution was defeated before it could be carried out, and so the *corvée* endured until 1864. See Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 273.

[56] Christopher Clark, 'After 1848: The European Revolution in Government', *Transactions of the RHS*, 22 (2012), 171-197, 171.

progress and politics. The counterrevolution divided them. It provincialised the principality, and used progress to undermine politics. In 1855, the Russian intellectual Alexander Herzen lamented the failure of the revolution(s) of 1848 to tear down the old order. 'Modern man,' he wrote in *From the Other Shore,* 'only builds a bridge—it will be for the unknown man of the future to pass over it.'[57] It had seemed for a moment in spring that the revolutionaries of 1848 could both build and cross that bridge. The breakdown of cosmopolitan unity and the rise of the counterrevolutionaries saw to it that they couldn't, but the effects of their struggles would reverberate through the ensuing decades. Revolutionary participation politicised the peoples of Wallachia and Europe, and regimes across the continent would have to grapple with the consequences.

[57] Alexander Herzen, trans. Moura Budberg & Richard Wollheim, *From the Other Shore & The Russian People and Socialism,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 3.

I. The Dawn of the Present

The Danubian Principalities were beyond the cultural and political horizons of most mid-nineteenth-century Europeans. Few would have known a Moldavian or a Wallachian personally, and fewer still would have visited one of the two principalities. Those who did wrote often exoticised accounts of the lands that they found. The Bible Society agent Benjamin Barker described the character of the society in a letter from Bucharest in September 1834. 'Iniquity,' he wrote, 'reigns here undisturbed and Satan wields his sceptre with unmolested sway.' Since his arrival in July he had learnt that 'sin exists in forms so horrid as to pass all bounds of conception,' and worse still, that it was 'viewed with callous indifference.'[1] In German, to be *in der Walachei* meant and means to be out in the boondocks, in the sticks or the middle of nowhere, and in his novel *The Sleepwalkers,* the twentieth-century writer Hermann Broch wrote that one character had spent two years 'in Roumania or Bessarabia or somewhere at the back of beyond.'[2] The principalities were neither causes célèbres, like Poland, nor sites of classical interest, like Italy or Greece, but they were still European, and visitors did acknowledge similarities. William Wilkinson found 'many elegant houses built in the most modern style of European architecture' in Iași, and he described the great winter balls of Bucharest's clubs as resembling the masked Redoutes of Vienna.[3] The American traveller James Noyes, who visited the principalities in the 1850s, wrote that 'the furniture, cuisine, language, dress—everything' at the *Hotel d'Europe* in Bucharest 'was French. Having traversed Europe, I could have believed myself lodged again in Paris.'[4]

Wealthy Moldavians and Wallachians would have been delighted by Noyes' comparison. The average citizen of Paris or Vienna might not have been familiar with their Southeastern European homelands, but the upper echelons of Moldavian and Wallachian society were well-acquainted with European culture. Both Bucharest and Iași were blessed with 'several German and French coachmakers, carpenters, builders, architects, teachers of European languages and music, physicians, and apothecaries,' and to these could be added

---

[1] Quoted in E.D. Tappe, 'A Bible Society Agent in the Rumanian Principalities', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 42.99 (1964), 388-402, 394.
[2] Hermann Broch, trans. Willa & Edwin Muir, *The Sleepwalkers: a Trilogy*, (London: Vintage, 1996), 363. In the German original: 'Heinrich Wendling war seit zwei Jahren in Rumänien oder Besarabien oder sonst wo da drunten.'
[3] William Wilkinson, *An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia: with Various Political Observations Relating to Them*, (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1820), 87 & 138.
[4] James O. Noyes, *Roumania: The Border Land of the Christian and the Turk, Comprising Adventures or Travels in Eastern Europe and Western Asia*, (New York: Rudd & Carleton, 1857), 118.

tailors and hatters, too.[5] Shops sold pomade, *eau de cologne,* and *eau de lavande* from Hamburg, hats manufactured from pig bristles, leathers, and feathers purchased in Paris, shawls imported from Leipzig, and cambric and calico brought over from Berlin.[6] Many wealthy boyars travelled to Vienna and Paris to experience the delights and frivolities of the great European cities, and some spent a little too freely. One *Monsieur Vacaresco* of Buzău was still being chased for the debts he incurred during a trip to Paris more than a decade after he returned home.[7]

But not all travellers went west seeking good times and diversion. A generation of young men hoped to enrol in the universities and learn at the feet of prominent writers, historians, and scientists like Jules Michelet and Edgar Quinet in Paris and Alexander von Humboldt and Friedrich Karl von Savigny in Berlin. These young Moldavian and Wallachian thinkers wrote accounts of their national pasts that situated the two principalities within the course of European history, and they envisioned their national future along European lines. The pioneer of this trend in the Danubian Principalities was Dinicu Golescu, who wrote an account of his travels through Europe on his return to Wallachia and recommended domestic reforms that would help his homeland to move in a European direction.[8] Golescu encouraged his sons Ștefan and Nicolae to follow in his footsteps, and the two young men travelled to Geneva to study under Rodolphe Töpffe, a disciple of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.[9] They weren't alone either. There were thirty Moldavian and Wallachian students in Paris and Geneva in 1830, but by 1848 there were nearly 100.[10] Many gravitated towards the Collège de France and the lectures of Michelet and Quinet. Their choice was both political and pragmatic. Michelet and Quinet were among the leading liberal intellectuals of the city, and students at the Collège de France didn't sit exams. Outside of the lecture hall, three of these students—Ion Ghica, Scarlat Vârnav, and C.A. Rosetti—founded the Society of Romanian Students in

---

[5] Wilkinson, *Wallachia and Moldavia*, 177-178.
[6] Biblioteca Națională a României (BNR), Fond Saint-Georges P CCXXXV/3 22 & 60 and P CCXXXV/4 121. Any researchers interested in the material culture of mid-century Bucharest would do well to consult packets CCXXXV/3 to CCXXXV/6, which form the Arhiva Stephănescu - Arephy Gabriel, and contain fabric samples and a wealth of bills and receipts from suppliers in Leipzig and elsewhere, as well as records of sale covering the period from the 1830s through the 1850s.
[7] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P CCXCV/4.
[8] See Alex Drace-Francis, 'Dinicu Golescu's *Account of My Travels* (1826): Eurotopia as Manifesto', in Wendy Bracewell & Alex Drace-Francis eds., *Balkan Departures: Travel Writing from Southeastern Europe,* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 47-74.
[9] Anastasie Iordache, *Goleștii: locul și rolul lor în istoria României,* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1979), 40.
[10] Drace-Francis, *Modern Romanian Culture*, 103. Many others studied medicine and law at Buda, which was, according to Alex Drace-Francis 'as important a centre as Paris for Romanian students in higher education in Europe'. See Alex Drace-Francis, 'Cultural currents and political choices: Romanian intellectuals in the Banat to 1848', *Austrian History Yearbook,* 36 (2005), 65-93, 76.

Paris in December 1845. A library was established in Vârnav's home at 3 *Place de la Sorbonne,* and the great poet and historian Alphonse de Lamartine became the society's patron.[11]

Many members of the Society of Romanian Students in Paris would go on to play prominent roles in the revolutionary events of 1848 and the unification of the two principalities in 1859, and historians have tended to see their pre-revolutionary activities in the light of subsequent events. When he compiled his six-volume collection of documents on the revolutions of 1848, Ion C. Brătianu included the founding charters of both the Society of Romanian Students in Paris and the Society for the Education of the Romanian People, as well as the statutes of the Romanian Literary Association from 1847.[12] Cornelia Bodea considered the establishment of the Paris society as one of the first moves in the struggle for a free and independent Romania, and even Alex Drace-Francis has conflated pre-revolutionary currents with the events that followed.[13] 'Perhaps we need to talk about intellectual activity,' he wrote, 'as a euphemism or alibi for revolution, rather than a cause of it.'[14] Many of these accounts share common ground with histories of the Italian Risorgimento, but where scholars like Lucy Riall, Derek Beales, Denis Mack Smith, and Harry Hearder have all questioned the idea of Italian unification as the culmination of a long process, the history of Wallachia and Moldavia has yet to receive such a treatment.[15] Historians instead write of a 'Forty-Eighter Epoch' that began around 1829 or discuss phases in the development of 'forty-eightism'.[16] Neither label is helpful, and historians should be warier of attributing revolutionary intent or interest to the societies and intellectual currents of the two decades before 1848. The first two names on the list of subscribers for the Romanian Literary Association in the year 1846/47 were those of the rulers of the two principalities: Gheorghe Bibescu of Wallachia and Mihail Sturdza of Moldavia. Further down the list is Alexandru Vilara, the hated Wallachian Secretary of State who fled abroad after Bibescu's abdication.[17]

Revolution wasn't on the horizon. In his work *Futures Past,* the German conceptual historian Reinhart Koselleck posited that the distinction between evolution and revolution

---

[11] *Anul 1848,* I, 17-23 for the brochure establishing the society and 23-27 for the brochure regarding the library.
[12] *Anul 1848*, I, 11, 16-27, 44-49.
[13] See, for instance, Bodea, *Lupta românilor,* 22-26.
[14] Drace-Francis, *Modern Romanian Culture,* 68.
[15] See, for instance, Derek Beales & Eugenio Biagini, *Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy,* (London: Pearson, 2002), 2nd edn; Lucy Riall, *The Italian Risorgimento: State, Society, and National Unification,* (London: Routledge, 1994); Harry Hearder, *Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento, 1790-1870,* (Harlow: Longman, 1983).
[16] See, for instance, Dinu Balan, *Național, naționalism, xenofobie și antisemitism în societatea românească modernă*, (Iași: Ed. Junimea, 2006), 265; Paul Cornea & Mihai Zamfir eds., *Gîndirea Românească în epoca pașoptistă* (Bucharest: Editura pentru literature, 1968-1969) 2 vols; and Vasile Cristian, *Istoriografia pașoptistă*, (Iași: Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza, 1996).
[17] *Anul 1848*, I, 58-60.

was to be found 'on a political plane.' These two concepts were 'antitheses' or 'partisan concepts.'[18] But the opposition between evolution and revolution was contingent. Support for one didn't necessitate opposition to the other. In mid-nineteenth-century Europe they could belong to two different temporalities. Evolution was a matter of progress and was therefore oriented towards the future. It was about moral and economic improvement. Revolution was a political question and so was concerned with the present. A man could get wealthier, but freedom of speech and the press were understood in absolute terms. Time could not make speech freer. The distinction between these two spheres was widely understood in mid-nineteenth-century Europe. It was perfectly possible to write—as Alexis de Tocqueville did in his 1856 account of *l'Ancien Régime et la Revolution*—that the revolution was 'not obliged, as others have supposed, to change the character of our civilization or halt its progress.'[19] Tocqueville's contemporary, the Prussian conservative theorist Friedrich Julius Stahl, described revolution as a 'continuing condition, a new order of things' in an 1852 speech on 'What is the Revolution?' It was not a 'single, unique act,' but the 'authentic, world-historical signature of our era,' neither past nor future, but an ongoing present. Stahl's revolutionary present began with the French Revolution of 1789, but his speech could only have come in the wake of 1848, which broadened the revolution's European horizons and occasioned a temporal and paradigmatic shift across the continent. It was the dawn of the political present for many Europeans. The French Revolution of 1789 might have led people to recognise that they were living through history, as Peter Fritzsche has argued, but it was the revolutions of 1848 that brought what Christopher Clark described as 'the ascendency of the moment as an experiential and hermeneutic category.'[20] The revolution's participants projected this development onto the past. It was only after 1848 that Nicolae Bălcescu could write of 'the course of revolution in Romanian history'.[21]

Before 1848 the young Moldavian and Wallachian intellectuals were more interested in the past and the future than they were in the present. They were not agents of radical revolutionary change. They wrote histories of the two principalities, and they published essays on agriculture, education, and other subjects pertaining to the future development of their homelands. Their eyes were turned towards Europe. Models were sought in England, France, Prussia, and elsewhere. Historians have often downplayed these activities. Radu Florescu

[18] Reinhart Koselleck, trans. Keith Tribe, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 51.
[19] Alexis de Tocqueville, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, Jon Elster ed., *The Ancien Régime and the French Revolution,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 26.
[20] Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present*, 11-54; Clark, *Time and Power,* 149.
[21] Nicolae Bălcescu, 'Mersul Revoluției', reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere,* II, 107-113.

wrote that 'one of the common features of East European revolutionaries has always been the superficiality of their liberalism,' but as Jennifer Pitts has shown, the liberalism of men like John Stuart Mill could be just as contradictory, and it would be a mistake to refer to the young intellectuals as revolutionaries before the outbreak of revolution.[22] Too much attention has been given to plot and conspiracy and too little to the more conventional and public activities of these young men. In imagining their national pasts and futures they also imagined their continent, and these commitments to the broader horizons of Europe would shape the revolutionary present that they helped to forge in 1848.

PAST

Nicolae Bălcescu reached Palermo on 1 March 1847. He had travelled from Paris via Marseille, Livorno, and Naples to visit his friends Vasile Alecsandri and Elena Negri, who had taken residence at the *Villa Delfina* outside of the city.[23] Bălcescu found a room nearby, and every afternoon he joined his friends to sit and read poetry on the terrace, but when Alecsandri and Negri departed for Moldavia in May 1847, Bălcescu remained in Italy. His visit wasn't only a social one. He had work to do, and from Palermo he travelled to Naples, Rome, Florence, and Genoa before returning to Paris in June. He was hunting for documents on early Moldavian and Wallachian history.[24]

Italy might seem a strange place to seek material on Romanian history, but many European intellectuals of the early and mid-nineteenth century attempted to demonstrate the historicity of their national communities. Their ideas were grounded in an explicitly European ideological framework. History was considered a European phenomenon. In *The Philosophy of History,* Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel described Africa as 'the land of

---

[22] Radu R. Florescu, *The Struggle Against Russia in the Romanian Principalities: A Problem in Anglo-Turkish Diplomacy, 1821-1854*, (Iași: The Center for Romanian Studies, 1997), 223; See Jennifer Pitts, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

[23] For a brief account of this trip, see P.P. Panaitescu, *Contribuții la o Biografia a lui N. Bălcescu,* (București: Tip. Convorbiri Literare Strada Câmpineanu No. 17, 1923), 65-66. On the 'European dimension' of Bălcescu's thoughts on history, see Ion Popa, 'Elemente de teoria istoriei la Nicolae Bălcescu și dimensiunea lor europeană', Revista de Istorie, 31 (1978), 793-808.

[24] Valeriu Stan, trans. Delia Răzolescu, *Nicolae Bălcescu, 1819-1852*, (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1977), 36. The Sicilian air must have made an impression on Bălcescu. His health had been poor since spending two years confined in Mărgineni Monastery at the beginning of the decade for conspiring against the ruling Prince of Wallachia, Alexandru II Ghica, and he returned to Sicily during his post-revolutionary exile. He took a room at the *Hotel Alla Trinacria* in Palermo and died of tuberculosis during the night of 29 November 1852 at the age of thirty-three. His body was buried in the cemetery of the city's Capuchin Monastery.

childhood,' which lay 'beyond the day of self-conscious history.'[25] History was the preserve of European civilisation, and national claims needed to be connected to the European story. In *The Books and the Pilgrimage of the Polish Nation,* Adam Mickiewicz wrote of the Christian unity of 'all the nations that believed, whether Germans, or Italians, or French, or English, or Poles.'[26] He accorded Poland a special place in the European constellation. It was the 'Christ' of nations. It would rise again and 'free all the nations of Europe from slavery.' The 'resurrection of the Polish nation' would see 'warfare among Christians come to an end.'[27] The same ideological impetus drove the Hungarian historian Mihály Horváth, the Lithuanian Simonas Daukantas, and the Czech František Palacký. All three men wrote histories of their national communities from their origins until the present day, and they connected these pasts to Europe. Palacký noted that the Bohemian lands occupied 'the heart of Europe' and thus 'for many centuries the Czech nation has been the central point where elements and principles of national, state, and Church life in modern Europe have come into contact.'[28] Daukantas stressed the Indo-European origins of the Lithuanians, and Horváth's 1835 prize-winning essay on ancient Hungarian civilization was titled *Parallel between the Moral and Social Conditions of the Early Hungarians and the Peoples of Europe.* Attempts to historicise national communities would continue across the nineteenth and into the twentieth century.[29]

The cult of history was common to European societies, and its outlook was European. In his *Histoire Générale de la Civilisation en Europe,* François Guizot wrote that it was 'obvious' that a European civilisation existed, and although he placed France at the centre of that civilisation, he acknowledged that it couldn't be studied in the context of one state alone.[30] The work's English translator celebrated Guizot's account of 'the whole frame-work of the

---

[25] G.W.F. Hegel, trans. J. Sibree, *Lectures on the Philosophy of History,* (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1861), 95. For a critique of Hegel, see Ronald Kuykendell, 'Hegel and Africa: An Evaluation of the Treatment of Africa in The Philosophy of History', *Journal of Black Studies,* 23 (1993), 571-581.

[26] Adam Mickiewicz, trans. Krystyn Lach-Szyrma, *The Books and the Pilgrimage of the Polish Nation,* (London: James Ridgway, 1833), 5.

[27] Mickiewicz, *Polish Nation,* 20-21. On Mickiewicz's influence in France, see Lloyd S. Kramer, *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830-1848,* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 177-226. On Polish historiography and European civilisation more generally, see Jerzy Jedlicki, *A Suburb of Europe: Nineteenth-century Polish Approaches to Western Civilization,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1999), 3-50.

[28] See Monika Baár, *Historians and Nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), esp. 19-45 & 256-288. Palacký quotation at 277.

[29] See John Breuilly, 'On the principle of nationality', in Gareth Stedman Jones & Gregory Claeys eds., *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Political Thought,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 77-109; See also Serhii M. Plokhy, 'The History of a "Non-historical" Nation: Notes on the Nature and Current Problems of Ukrainian Historiography', *Slavic Review* 54 (1995), 709-716 and Tomasz Hen-Konarski, 'No Longer just Peasants and Priests: The Most Recent Studies on Nation Building in Nineteenth-Century Ukraine', *European History Quarterly* 45 (2015), 713-737.

[30] François Guizot, *Histoire Générale de la Civilisation en Europe depuis la chute de l'Empire Romain jusqu'a la Révolution Française,* 3ème édition, (Paris: Didier, 1840), 3-4. 'il est évident qu'il y a une civilisation européenne…il est évident que cette civilisation ne peut être puisée dans l'histoire d'un seul des États européens.'

great social system to which *we* belong' (emphasis added), and his preface was translated and included in the book's third French edition.[31] Romanian speakers could read Guizot's work in their own language, and translations of Goldsmith, Montesquieu, and the Russian progressive I.K. Kaidanov were also available.[32] A brief history of Poland was published in the Transylvanian *Foaie pentru Minte, Inimă, și Literatură* in March 1847, and in the same year the Romanian Literary Association recommended universal histories by the German scholars Karl Heinrich Ludwig Pölitz and Karl von Rotteck.[33] Several Moldavian and Wallachian scholars and schoolteachers also wrote their own universal histories, although most were derivative of books available in other languages.[34]

Wallachian and Moldavian accounts of their own histories followed the same contours as those of the other nations of East and Central Europe. They began with the origins of the national community, moved into a golden age, and then entered decline.[35] These three epochs were defined by their relationship to European civilisation. The origins of the Wallachians and the Moldavians were to be found in the Roman settlement of the province of Dacia; their apogee came with the defence of Christianity against the Muslim threat from the East; and their nadir followed their subjection to Ottoman suzerainty and the introduction of Phanariot rule.[36]

The story of the Romanians had been told before, but interest in it exploded during the 1830s and 1840s. The Transylvanian scholar Petru Maior was the first to write an account in the national language. His *Istoria pentru Începutul Românilor în Dacia* was the only book to appear on the subject before 1821, and in it he argued for the people's Roman origins.[37] The Banat-born Damaschin Bojincă restated this position in the early nineteenth century, and it became an article of faith for the generation of young scholars who came of age during the later 1830s and 1840s. Forty-eight new works of Romanian history were published between 1821 and

---

[31] François Guizot, *General History of Civilisation in Europe, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution,* 2nd edition, (Oxford: D.A. Talboys, 1838), iii; Guizot, *Histoire Générale de la Civilisation en Europe,* ix-xvi.
[32] Vasile Cristian, *Contribuția istoriografiei la pregătirea ideologică a revoluției române de la 1848*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1985), 32.
[33] *Foaie pentru Minte, Inimă, și Literatură* No. 10, Monday 10 March, 1847.*Anul 1848*, I, 50-51.
[34] Vasile Cristian, 'Cerințele luptei naționale românești din preajma anului 1848 și reflectarea lor în tematica scrierilor istorice', in Nicolae Edroiu et al. eds., *Stat, Societate, Națiune. Interpretări Istorice*, (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia Cluj-Napoca, 1982), 301-314, 301-302; for an example of a universal history that was written for Romanian schoolteachers, see Florian Aaron, *Elemente de istoria lumii,* (Bucharest, 1845).
[35] See Breuilly, 'On the principle of nationality', 94. Breuilly writes that the Dacian period was seen as the golden age for Romanians, but it was actually the medieval period, and most eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholars neglected the Dacian period.
[36] Ottoman suzerainty remained in place after the fall of the Phanariots and beyond the revolution. See chapter 4 for the geopolitical context of the revolution. On ideas of suzerainty in the two Danubian Principalities more generally, see Andrei-Dan Sorescu, 'National History as a History of Compacts Jus Publicum Europaeum and Suzerainty in Romania in the Mid-Nineteenth Century,' *East Central Europe* 45(1) (2018), 63-93.
[37] See Petru Maior, *Istoria pentru Începutul Românilor în Dacia,* (Buda, 1812).

1847, and most of these were printed in the second half of this period.[38] Several historical magazines also appeared. The most successful was *Magazinu Istoricu pentru Dacia,* which was edited by the Transylvanian August Treboniu Laurian and the Wallachian Nicolae Bălcescu. Five volumes were printed in Bucharest between 1845 and 1847.[39] The fourth issue included a chronology of Romanian history compiled by Laurian. His timeline began with the foundation of Rome by Romulus and Remus, and the date of every subsequent event was identified by three different calendars: before or after the birth of Christ, since Adam, and 'the years of Rome'.[40]

Roman heritage connected the Moldavians and Wallachians to the peoples of Western Europe, and their language proved this cultural concord. Their ancestors weren't Dacians. 'The greater part of the Dacians,' wrote Mihail Kogălniceanu in his *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie et des Valaques Transdanubiens,* 'had been wiped out,' and so the Romans had to send 'a great number of Roman colonists from across the Empire.'[41] Some stayed behind when the Roman Empire retreated, and the Moldavians and Wallachians were their descendants. Their language retained this heritage. It wasn't Slavic, Turkic, or Finno-Ugric. It was Latinate. 'The Romanian language,' wrote A.T. Laurian, 'shares a great affinity with Spanish, not Hungarian; it has the same affinity with Italian, not Albanian; and it has much in common with French, nothing with Turkish.'[42] More than a thousand years had passed since the fall of the Roman Empire, but the Romanians had preserved its linguistic legacy, and they celebrated their ties to the rest of Europe. 'Even if I weren't a Romanian,' wrote the Moldavian Costache Negruzzi, 'I would still love the Romanian language for its brotherly love… it hasn't forgotten its mother and sisters. It keeps its links to Latin through its grammar, to Italian and Spanish through its expressions, and to Portuguese through its

---

[38] Cristian, *Istoriografia pașoptistă*, 13-32 on Damaschin Bojincă; Cristian, *Contribuția istoriografiei*, 113-118.
[39] The first issue in 1845 was printed in the Romanian Transitional Alphabet, which mixed both Latin and Cyrillic characters, but by the final issue in 1847 Laurian and Bălcescu had adopted a fully Latin script. Laurian was one of the most fervent promoters of the adoption of Latin characters in Romanian. See Victor-Tudor Roșu, 'A.T. Laurian, editor și redactor la *Magazin istoric pentru Dacia*', *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica* 13 (2009), 125-145 and Victor-Tudor Roșu, 'Concepție și metodă istorică la August Treboniu Laurian. Episodul *Magazinului istoric pentru Dacia*', *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica* 9 (2005), 65-82.
[40] Laurian also included a number of other events of Roman history, including the conquest of the Italian peninsula and the defeat of Hannibal. See A.T. Laurian, 'Cronologia Daciei si a Romaniloru', *Magazinu Istoricu pentru Dacia* IV (Bucharest, 1847), 221-230, 221. 'annii Romei'
[41] Mihail Kogălniceanu, *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie et des Valaques Transdanubiens, Tome Premier. Histoire de la Dacie, des Valaques Transdanubiens et de la Valachie (1241-1792),* (Berlin: Librairie de B. Behr, 13, Oberwallstrasse, 1837), 9. 'Comme la plupart des Daces avaient été extirpés, il [Trajan] envoya dans leur pays un grand nombre de colons romains de tout l'Empire.'
[42] A.T. Laurian, 'Cercetări Despre Limbă', in Mariana & Petre Costinescu eds., *Propășirea: foaie științifică și literatură/studiu introductiv, note și comentarii de Paul Cornea*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1980), 326-333, 330-333. 'Limba Românească are cea mai mare afinitate cu cea spănească și nici una cu cea ungurească; asemine afinitate are cu cea italiană și nici una cu cea albană; multă cu ceafrancească și nici uuna cu cea turcească.'

pronunciation.'[43] These linguistic similarities overcame the gaps in the documentary record for A.T. Laurian. They could 'only be explained by the affinities… of the blood. In this way, many things are revealed to us where history is silent.'[44] Neither Negruzzi nor Laurian was attempting to convince a foreign power to support their national cause. Their articles were written in the Romanian transitional alphabet and published in a weekly gazette that was printed at Iași. By defining the Moldavians and the Wallachians as the descendants of the Romans, these intellectuals placed their peoples on the side of European civilisation.

The Moldavians and Wallachians belonged to the great Roman family, and if there were differences of habit and custom between them and their Western European cousins, then these could be explained by contemporary science. Mihail Kogălniceanu had studied in Berlin, where one of his teachers, Friedrich Carl von Savigny, introduced him to Alexander von Humboldt. Humboldt was working on his most ambitious and far-reaching project at the time: *Cosmos. A Sketch of the Physical Description of the Universe.* He enlisted scientists, classicists, explorers, and historians to help in the endeavour. Humboldt hoped to cover all the known world, and the young Kogălniceanu penned a treatise on the history, customs, and language of the Roma for the naturalist's benefit.[45] But Kogălniceanu also took from Humboldt's work. The German was a pioneer in the theory of ecosystems. On the slopes of the Andean mountain of Chimborazo he had found oaks and conifers like those common to European forests, alpine plants resembling those of the Swiss mountains, and lichens similar to samples taken from the Arctic Circle.[46] These discoveries would inform his and Aimé Bonpland's *Essai sur la Géographie des Plantes,* which moved botany away from taxonomies and towards a science based on the relationships between plants, climate, and geography.[47] Kogălniceanu adapted this idea to history. As plants accustomed themselves to their climatic and geographical circumstances, so had the Romans in Dacia. 'In changing their country,' wrote Kogălniceanu, they had 'naturally had to change many of their habits and customs.' They

---

[43] Costache Negruzzi, 'Despre Limba Românească: Scrisoarea a treia', in Costinescu*, Propășirea,* 650-653, 650-651. '…și de n-aș și fi roman, încă aș iubi limba română pentru dragostea frățească ce o caracterisește…româna nu-și uită muma și surorile sale, se ținu lipită de Latina prin gramatică, de italiana și spanioala prin zicerile sale, de portugheza prin pronunție.'

[44] A.T. Laurian, 'Cercetări Despre Limbă', in Costinescu*, Propășirea*, 332-333. 'Această afinitate și disparitate a limbelor nu se poate esplica decît prin afinitatea și disparitatea sîngelui. Așadar, pre această cale ne descurcă de multe ori unde istoria tace.'

[45] Michel de Kogalnitchan, *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les mœurs et la langue des Cigains, connus en France sous le nom de Bohémiens suivie d'un recueil de sept cents mots Cigains,* (Berlin: Librairie de B. Behr, 1837); Mihaela Mudure, 'Blackening Gypsy Slavery: The Romanian Case', in Heike Raphael-Hernandez ed., *Blackening Europe: the African American presence*, (London: Routledge, 2004), 263-283, 264; For Humboldt's work on *Cosmos*, see Andrea Wulf, *The Invention of Nature: The Adventures of Alexander von Humboldt, the Lost Hero of Science*, (London: John Murray, 2015), 235-248.

[46] Wulf, *Invention of Nature,* 4-5

[47] Wulf, *Invention of Nature*, 127-129.

had moved from a hot climate to a cold one and so 'had to modify their way of life, their homes, their clothing.'[48]

Roman habits were important in establishing proprietorship over the land and reinforced the Moldo-Wallachians' European identity. A year before his visit to Italy in 1847, Nicolae Bălcescu published a social history of the ploughmen in the Romanian Principalities.[49] His decision to write about ploughmen rather than peasants or farmers was calculated. The plough was a symbol of virtue. It called to mind the Roman patrician Cincinnatus, who had left his plough to save Rome from invasion and then relinquished his dictatorial powers to return to his farm.[50] Bălcescu's nineteenth-century contemporaries connected it with the progress of civilisation and liberty. In his *Paroles d'un Croyant,* which circulated in Romanian in manuscript form before appearing in print in 1848, the French political theorist Hugues-Félicité Robert de Lamennais described liberty as 'a woman whose eye is proud and whose brow serene; with a firm hand she draws a light furrow, and wherever the ploughshare passes I see human generations rise up and invoke her in their prayers and bless her in their hymns.'[51] Bălcescu's account began with the relationship between land ownership and colonialism. He described two types of society: one formed by colonisation, in which land was owned privately, and another created by conquest, in which land was held by the state. Bălcescu considered the first arrangement to be superior. It was the one 'common to all the peoples of Europe,' while the other was to be found in Asia, Peru, Mexico, and Africa. Colonists were agricultural people. They moved to gain the 'peace, liberty, or material good fortune that they lacked in their homelands.'[52] The Romans were farmers. The Dacians were not. By asserting the Roman origins of the Moldo-Wallachian people, Bălcescu accorded them ownership of the land and a place in Europe.

The fall of the Roman Empire threatened the collapse of European civilisation, but the Moldo-Wallachians rose to defend its Christian unity against the threat from the east. In his history of Wallachia, the Transylvanian schoolteacher Florian Aaron wrote of the 'times of barbarism and stifled moans, of wars, flight, fire, desolation and slavery' that followed Rome's

---

[48] Kogălniceanu, *Histoire,* 25. 'Les Romains en changeant de patrie, ont dû changer nécessairement beaucoup de leurs habitudes et de leurs mœurs; la cause en est toute naturelle. Venant d'un climat chaud dans un pays froid, ils durent modifier leur manière de vivre, leurs demeures, leurs habillemens.'

[49] Nicolae Bălcescu, 'Despre starea soțială a muncitorilor plugari în principatele române în deosebite timpuri', *Magazinu Istoricu pentru Dacia,* II (1846), 229-246.

[50] The story may or may not be true, but it appears in Livy's *History of Rome*, book 3, chapters 26-29.

[51] Quoted in Maurice Agulhon, *Marianne into Battle: Republican Imagery and Symbolism in France 1789-1880*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 41.

[52] Bălcescu, 'Plugari', *Magazinu Istoricu* II, 229. 'Ea este astăzi comun la toate popoarele Europene.…coloniștii ce se espatriază ca să dobândească pacea, libertatea sau buna stare materială ce se lipsește în locul lor de naștere.'

retreat. From these unhappy times rose three powerful princes who were animated by 'the spirit of the age and European civilisation.'[53] Over a thousand years had passed between these two epochs, but Moldo-Wallachian historians emphasised their continuity. In his opening remarks for the Academia Mihaileană, Mihail Kogălniceanu leapt from the Roman era, when the Danube basin served as 'the theatre where the fate of the empire against the barbarians' and of 'civilisation against barbarism' would be decided, to the medieval Christian struggle against the Turkish Muslim threat.[54] Narratives that described the role of Eastern European peoples in defending Christian Europe against a Muslim threat were common to the period. The Hungarian Mihály Horváth wrote that 'since the beginning of the fifteenth century Hungary was almost the sole guardian… of the peaceful progress of Christian civilization, which was in danger of being engulfed by the ominously expanding power of the Ottoman Empire,' and Polish historians pushed similar claims. As Monika Baár has suggested, these accounts challenged ideas of Western European historical superiority and gave Eastern Europe its place in European civilisation.[55]

Modern Romanian scholars have tended to emphasise ideas of Romanian unity in their nineteenth-century forebears' accounts, but the ties of Christianity and European civilisation were stronger. Vasile Cristian argued that the two principal preoccupations of nineteenth-century medieval scholars were national independence and unity. They celebrated the Moldavian Prince Ștefan cel Mare (Stephen the Great) for his wars against the Turks, but criticised his assaults on neighbouring Wallachia.[56] This criticism had less to do with national unity and more to do with the brotherhood of Christian nations. The wars against the Turks were not only for the benefit of Moldavia or Wallachia. They served the interests of European Christianity, too. Mihail Kogălniceanu described the Battle of Războieni of 1476 as 'one of the most important in the history of Moldavia,' but it wasn't only celebrated in Iași. All of Europe rejoiced, and 'every church in Rome celebrated the Defender of Christianity, the name which Ștefan won for himself with his tireless sword.'[57] He had repelled 'Turkish

---

[53] Florian Aaron, 'Precuvîntare la idee repede de istoria prințipatului Țării Românești', reprod. In Paul Cornea & Mihai Zamfir eds., *Gîndirea Românească în epoca pașoptistă* (Bucharest: Editura pentru literature, 1968-1969) 2 vols, vol. I, 141-149, 145-146. '…vremile acele de barbarie și gemăt înghesuit, războaiele, fugile, focul, pustirile, robirile ce au călcat des pe această țară……de duhul veacului și al civilizației Europii…'

[54] Mihail Kogălniceanu, 'Cuvînt pentru Deschiderea Cursului de Istorie națională în Academia Mihaileană', in Costinescu, *Propășirea*, 622-635, 622-623. '…patria noastră, schimbată în colonie romană, începe a se face teatrul unde soarta imperiei se hotărăște de cătră barbari; la Dunărea este lupta între barbarie și civilizație.'

[55] Baár, *Historians and Nationalism,* 283-4.

[56] Cristian, *Contribuția istoriografiei,* 88.

[57] Mihail Kogălniceanu, 'Bătălia de la Războieni și pricinile ei 26 iulie 1476,' in Mihail Kogălniceanu, Dan Simonescu ed., *Opere,* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974-1989), 5 vols, vol I, 157-167, 157-159. 'Una din bătăliile cele mai însămnate din istoria Moldaviei…Toate puterile străine se

barbarism' and 'defended European civilisation.'[58] Kogălniceanu didn't limit his praise to Moldavian and Wallachian figures. He venerated the seventeenth-century Polish Jan Sobieski for his participation in the struggle against the Ottomans, too.[59] It was a Christian struggle rather than a national one, and Nicolae Bălcescu shared Kogălniceanu's interpretation. In his account of the campaign of 1595, he wrote that it was only when 'all the neighbouring peoples were in agreement that they were able to regain through unity what they had lost through discord and defeat the cruel tyrants beyond the (Dardanelle) straits.'[60] He didn't describe the triumph of Prince Mihai Viteazul (Michael the Brave) at the Battle of Călugăreni as a Wallachian or a Romanian victory, but as a Christian one.[61] Where Rome had stood for European unity in the classical period, Christianity served the same purpose for the medieval and early modern.

Belief in a Christian brotherhood of nations was common to nineteenth-century European liberals, and it defined Europe against an alien other. Adam Mickiewicz's accounts of Polish sacrifice impressed the Italian Giuseppe Mazzini. As Anna Procyk has argued, Mazzini's understanding of nationality wasn't defined by 'race or the existence of former or present statehood.' It was determined by 'the unique mission bestowed on each nationality by God.'[62] Article 28 of the Charter of the Association of the Polish People enshrined the same principle. It emphasised that all peoples had 'an important duty toward humanity,' that the men of all nations were 'brothers,' and as brothers they 'should respect each other and help each other to establish and defend freedom.'[63] But freedom wasn't a universal. It was an idea that was bound up with those of Christianity and European civilisation. Poland had sacrificed itself for the cause, and so had the Moldo-Wallachians. They had shed their blood for 'the defence of civilisation, liberty, and Europe.'[64]

The age of Moldo-Wallachian medieval glory ended with the dawn of Phanariot rule, which turned the eyes of the principalities towards the east. The Phanariot princes were

---

bucurară de biruința cîștigată de cătră Moldoveni asupra turcilor. Roma serbă în toate bisericile pre Apărătorul Creștinătății, nume ce Ștefan își cîștigase prin neobosita lui sabie.'

[58] Kogălniceanu, 'Ștefan cel Mare în tîrgul Băiei', in Kogălniceanu, *Opere* I, 195-204, 196. '…respingerea barbariei turcești și, prin urmare, în apărarea civilizației Europii'

[59] Kogălniceanu, 'Cuvînt pentru Deschiderea Cursului de Istorie,' in *Propășirea,* 624-625.

[60] Nicolae Bălcescu, 'Campania Românilor încontra Turcilor de la anul 1595', *Magazinu Istoricu pentru Dacia* IV (1847), 3-20 & 65-91, 14. '…cănd tóte popórele vecine sînt în bună înțelegere împreună, trebuie a redobăndi prin unire aceea ce au perdut prin discordie, și a goni pe acesti cruzi tirani dincolo de strimtóre (Dardanele)…'

[61] Bălcescu, 'Campania Românilor', *Magazinu Istoricu,* 20.

[62] Anna Procyk, 'Polish Émigrés as Emissaries of the "Risorgimento" in Eastern Europe', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 25 (2001), 7-30, 11-12.

[63] Quoted in Procyk, 'Polish Émigrés', 16.

[64] Nicolae Bălcescu, 'Comentarii asupra Batalii de la Cîmpii Rigăi sau Cosova (17, 18, 19 Octomvrie 1448),' in Costinescu, *Propășirea,* 574-585, 584-585. '…au vărsat sîngele pănă la unul pentru apărarea civilizației și a libertății, și Europa…'

Greek aristocrats who bought their positions from the Ottoman Porte. In practice, many belonged to the same families that had ruled Moldavia and Wallachia for years and would continue to do so after the Phanariot era ended with Tudor Vladimirescu's revolt in 1821.[65] But the Phanariot era was singled out for opprobrium by nineteenth-century historians. It had disrupted the historicity of the Moldavian and Wallachian peoples by corrupting and uprooting their institutions, and it was during this age of Oriental Despotism that the two principalities fell behind the rest of Europe. In his *Histoire,* Mihail Kogălniceanu contrasted the progress of European civilisation with the decline of Wallachia:

> Under these tax farmers, these princes who changed every day, under these slaves of despotism, Wallachia fell into decadence with as much speed as the other states of Europe were growing in grandeur and civilisation. In the eighteenth century, all the countries, even the distant lands of Asia and Africa, were touched by the civilisation of France and England: even China, old China, which for thousands of years had neither advanced nor retreated, was forced by Europe to take a step towards progress. Phanariot despotism was more powerful than the Great Wall of China, which couldn't prevent the European Enlightenment from entering the country. All the works on independence, on nationality, on civilisation, came crashing down when pitted against the tyranny of the Phanariot slaves, who were masters of Wallachia. A wall of despotism, more powerful than any of stone, surrounded the principality and separated it from the rest of Europe.[66]

Kogălniceanu's account of Phanariot rule was more sensational than factual, but it underlined the importance of European civilisation to Moldo-Wallachian ideas about history and progress. Contact with Europe had helped 'even China, old China… to take a step towards progress,' while the Phanariots divided Wallachia from the rest of Europe and shifted the principality's orientation towards the east. In doing so, they had estranged the people of the Danube basin from their cousins and exiled them from the course of European history.

The melancholy of the present greatly affected Nicolae Bălcescu. As he disappeared into the Italian archives, his friends Alecsandri and Negri boarded a ship bound for

---

[65] On Vladimirescu's revolt, see Florescu, *Struggle Against Russia,* 97-122.

[66] Kogălniceanu, *Histoire,* 371-372. 'Sous ces princes fermiers, sous ces princes qui étaient changés tous les jours, sous ces esclaves despotes, la Valachie tomba en décadence avec autant de vitesse que les autres états de l'Europe montaient en grandeur et en civilisation. Dans le dix-huitième siècle, tous les pays, même les plus éloignés de l'Asie et de l'Afrique prirent parte à la civilisation de la France et de l'Angleterre: la Chine même, cette vieille Chine qui depuis des milliers de siècles n'avance ni ne recule, fut forcée par l'Europe de faire un pas de plus dans le progrès. Le despotisme des Fanariotes fut plus puissant que la haute muraille des Chinois qui ne put pas empêcher les lumières de l'Europe d'entrer dans leur pays; tous les essais d'indépendance, de nationalité, de civilisation vinrent se briser contre la tyrannie des esclaves du Fanar, maîtres enfin de la Valachie. Un mur de despotisme, plus puissant qu'un de pierres entourait la principauté, et la séparait du reste de l'Europe…'

Constantinople. Negri was suffering from an unspecified lung condition, and she hoped to see her brother and her Moldavian homeland one last time. Bălcescu wrote to Alecsandri in October 1847 to offer his condolences.[67] He described their time in Sicily fondly, but said that he too had fallen into a depression. 'I no longer read,' he wrote. 'I don't write or enjoy myself or even take walks. I live in Paris, an unrivalled sphere of intellectual activity and pleasure, and I do nothing.'[68] It was a disaffection common to many young European intellectuals of the period.[69] The present was burdensome, but Bălcescu had an idea. In a contemporaneous speech to the Society of Romanian Students in Paris, he told his friends that they were living in a 'transitional epoch,' and he spoke of 'resurrection'.[70] He urged Alecsandri to join him in turning his suffering towards the interests of their homelands. The future could be better.

Future

The enthusiasm for the past among nineteenth-century European liberals was matched by their belief in the future progress of human civilisation. As Jennifer Pitts has shown, eighteenth-century ideas of tolerance and pluralist universalism were eclipsed in the early nineteenth century by new theories of progress that were 'more triumphalist, less nuanced, and less tolerant of cultural difference.'[71] Looking upon their national imperial missions, British and French liberals felt 'an increasingly secure belief that Europe's progressive civilisation granted Europeans the authority to suspend, in their relations with non-European societies, the moral and political standards they believed applied among themselves.'[72] Europe had reached a higher stage of development, but it had yet to reach its apogee. 'The golden age of the human race,' wrote Henri de Saint-Simon, 'is not behind us, it is ahead, it lies in the perfection of the social order.'[73] The Italian jurist and philosopher Gian Domenico

[67] N. Petrașcu, *Vasile Alecsandri, Studiu Critice*, (București: Grafic I.V. Socecu, 1894), 176-181.
[68] Bălcescu to Alecandri, 15 October 1847. Reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere,* IV, 78-80. 'Nu citesc mai nimic. Nu scriu de loc, nu petrec, nu mă plimb. Trăesc în Paris într-o sferă nemărginată de activitate intellectuală și de plăcere, fără a loa parte nici la una, nici la alta…'
[69] See, for instance, the case of Alexander Herzen. Aileen M. Kelly, *The Discovery of Chance: The Life and Thought of Alexander Herzen,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 173.
[70] Nicolae Bălcescu, 'Cuvîntare ținută la societatea studenților români din Paris,' in Bălcescu, *Opere* I, 171-178, 177. 'o epocă de tranziție' 'Învierea'
[71] Pitts, *Turn to Empire,* 240.
[72] Pitts, *Turn to Empire,* 11.
[73] Henri de Saint-Simon, *De la réorganisation de la société Européenne ou de la nécessité et des moyens de rassembler les peuples de l'Europe en un seul corps politique, en conservant a chacun son indépendance nationale,* (Paris, 1814), 112. '…L'âge d'or du

Romagnosi viewed the future in a similar light. Civilisation wasn't a condition; it was 'a continuous progress towards the best form of social life.'[74] And the French liberal economist Charles-Barthélemy Dunoyer believed that material progress would promote moral progress, and together the two would lead to an expansion of human freedom. 'We will only be free,' he wrote, 'when we become industrious and moral.'[75] Common to all of these thinkers was a sense that progress didn't just involve economic development. It demanded moral improvement, too.

Ideas of progress carried as much currency for liberals in Eastern Europe as they did among their Western European contemporaries, and they studied the examples of France, Britain, Prussia, and elsewhere to learn how they could catch up. In the 'idiom of the liberals,' according to the Polish historian Jerzy Jedlicki, 'nationality meant attachment to one's own country so long as it kept abreast of European progress.'[76] The objective of early nineteenth-century Polish thinkers was not to 'produce new, original Polish ideas,' but to learn from Western European advancements and to 'disseminate this knowledge in their own country.'[77] This attitude was shared in Hungary. 'The example of foreign nations,' wrote the statesman and political theorist István Széchenyi, 'can be useful.'[78] He was horrified by his own nation's backwardness, and he looked to Britain for an example of progress. He supported new infrastructure projects including railroads, steamboats, and a bridge linking Buda and Pest, and he established new spheres of sociability, including casinos and horse races, which he modelled after the British example. A visit to Pest Casino in 1840 led the poet and traveller Julia Pardoe to write that 'the library, although yet in its infancy, contains many valuable books of reference… Englishmen will find the Quarterly, Edinburgh and Westminster Reviews, the Athenaeum, Galignani's Messenger, and all the best continental journals.'[79] Visitors to the Bucharest library established by the Society for the Education of the

---

genre humain n'est point derrière nous, il est au-devant, il est dans la perfection de l'ordre social…' See also Walter M. Simon, 'History for Utopia: Saint-Simon and the Idea of Progress,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17 (1956), 311-331. Saint-Simon was a powerful draw for many young Moldavians and Wallachians in Paris. See Dan Berindei, 'Revoluționarii români de la 1848 și mișcarea democratică și socialistă din Europa', *Revista de Istorie*, 28 (1975), 1387-1399.

[74] Silvana Patriarca, *Numbers and Nationhood: Writing Statistics in nineteenth-century Italy,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 34-36.

[75] Charles-Barthélemy Dunoyer, *L'industrie et la morale considérées dans leurs rapports avec la liberté,* (Paris, 1825), 1. '…nous ne devenons *libres* qu'en devenant *industrieux* et *moraux.*' On Dunoyer and his context, see Annelien de Dijn, *French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville: Liberty in a Levelled Society?,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 89-110.

[76] Jedlicki, *A Suburb of Europe,* 27.

[77] Jedlicki, *A Suburb of Europe,* 41.

[78] Quoted in Alexander Maxwell & Alexander Campbell, 'István Széchenyi, the casino movement, and Hungarian nationalism, 1827-1848', *Nationalities Papers* 42 (2014), 508-526, 510.

[79] Quoted in George Baranyi, *Stephen Széchenyi and the awakening of Hungarian nationalism, 1791-1841,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), 170.

Romanian People would have found similar titles, although the bias tended more towards French rather than British periodicals.

The introduction of the Organic Regulations under the Russian administrator Pavel Kiselev was meant to inaugurate a new era of progress in the two Danubian Principalities. Reform programmes had been put forward before the Russian's arrival in 1829, but few were implemented, and those that were adopted had narrow horizons and enjoyed limited success.[80] Kiselev was no radical. As Anastasie Iordache has noted, 'the institutions established by the Organic Regulations tended neither towards democratisation nor the affirmation of liberty.'[81] His objective was to establish a modern state apparatus and create a climate for economic development.[82] In his inaugural speech to the Wallachian Assembly in 1831, he told his audience that he saw the principality's future in 'the great European family.'[83] New constitutional norms were introduced and laws were codified. But the greater impact came from his measures to ameliorate potential outbreaks of plague, improve the infrastructure of the two principalities, and increase their agricultural output. The 'guiding principle' of his reforms, according to Alexander Bitis, was to give to the two principalities 'the precepts of European statecraft,' to introduce 'enlightened rule within a conservative political and social framework, [and] to bring the benefits of civilisation to all classes.'[84] His agrarian reforms proved particularly successful. The Treaty of Adrianople in 1829 had abolished the Ottoman monopoly on agricultural exports, and within a decade the ports of Brăila and Galați were competing with Odessa to serve the European grain market.[85]

Many of the young liberals who came of age in the years between the introduction of the Organic Regulations and the outbreak of revolution in 1848 admired Kiselev's programme, but they had reservations about its implementation. Mihail Kogălniceanu believed that the Organic Regulations had made 'great progress' in improving the lives of the

---

[80] The Wallachian Phanariot ruler Constantin Ipsilanti, for instance, established new building regulations after an earthquake in 1802 and a fire in September 1804 destroyed almost two thousand homes in the principality's capital. See Florian Georgescu, 'Probleme de urbanism și sistematizare în București în anii 1831-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, IV (1966), 35-68, 36-37. On ideas of reform predating Kiselev, see Drace-Francis, 'Dinicu Golescu's *Account of My Travels* (1826)' and Georgescu, *Political Ideas and the Enlightenment.*

[81] Anastasie Iordache, *Principatele Române în epoca modernă*, (Bucharest: Albatros, 1996-), 2 vols, vol I, 26. 'Instituțiile preconizate în Regulamentele Organice nu tindeau în nici un fel spre democratizare, spre afirmarea vreunei libertății.' Radu Florescu shared Iordache's belief that the Organic Regulations were piecemeal and predicated on Russian interests rather than Moldavian and Wallachian ones. See Florescu, *Struggle Against Russia,* 177.

[82] Gh. Platon, *Geneza revoluției*, 79.

[83] Quoted in Alexander Bitis, *Russia and the Eastern Question: Army, Government, and Society: 1815-1833,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 443.

[84] Bitis, *Russia and the Eastern Question,* 460. See pages 441 to 463 for a general discussion of the Regulations from Kiselev's and the Russian perspective.

[85] On the Treaty of Adrianople, see Bitis, *Russia and the Eastern Question,* 349-377. On the Russian response to the economic threat posed by the principalities, see Florescu, *Struggle Against Russia,* 273-300.

urban poor, and in a letter to his friend George Bariț in April 1838, Florian Aaron described the Organic Regulations as a 'holy book.'[86] He saw in its pages 'the road to the happiness of Wallachia,' but the implementation of the reforms was imperfect. What use, he asked, were all of Kiselev's improvements when they were left 'in the hands of the aristocrats.' The men to whom it fell to put Kiselev's reforms into practice didn't value the public good; they had only their own interests at heart. Aaron saw two possible solutions to this problem. The first lay in the creation of a secondary aristocracy on the model of the English Whigs, but he thought this was unlikely to happen as the higher nobility had closed off the roads to advancement. The second option, which he considered both more likely and more just, was to educate the people about their rights.[87] Major improvements were needed to make that solution viable.

Progress was both a moral and an economic necessity, and it was seen as the only way to scale the heights of European civilisation. Many Eastern European intellectuals felt ashamed of the inability of their homelands to keep pace with Western Europe. The Russian writer Alexander Herzen lamented his country's backwardness in his diary in 1841. 'We have fallen behind the burden of our century and our country,' he wrote. 'We have no future.'[88] His words reflected an anxiety about Russia's place within European civilisation, and the young Wallachian boyar Ion Ghica had similar concerns for his own country. In an essay on scientific advancement he wrote that Moldavia and Wallachia lagged 'far behind the other nations of Europe.' The only industry in the two principalities was agriculture. Science was 'virtually unknown' and so was philosophy. These defects needed to be remedied to avoid 'shaming the century.'[89] Ghica had a broad understanding of science. He included philosophy, jurisprudence, and political economy under its heading. In his opening lecture for the new course in political economy at the Iași Academy in 1843 he told his audience that the subject at hand was 'the only means to our enlightenment in the search for material and moral improvement.'[90] The European industrial model was best. 'Europe,' he said, 'submits

---

[86] Mihail Kogălniceanu, 'Despre Pauperism,' in Kogălniceanu, *Opere,* I, 572-577, 574-575.
[87] Aaron to Bariț, 23 April 1838. Reprod. in Ștefan Pascu & Iosif Pervain eds., *George Bariț și contemporanii săi*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1973-), 8 vols, vol I, 11-13. 'Regulamentul Organic, afară de vreo cîteva întocmiri barbare, este o carte sfîntă, în care este brăzdat drumul fericirii Țării Românești. Dar ce folos, cînd atît dezvoltarea lui, cît și punerea în lucrare a întocmirilor se face de niște oameni care nu știu să prețuiască facerile de bine ale reformii și pe care egoismul lor cel înghiesuit în face ca să-și bată joc și de cele mai sfinte întocmiri…Regulamentul este în mina aristocraților; ei legiuiesc și ei executează cele legiuite.'
[88] Quoted in Kelly, *Discovery of Chance,* 243.
[89] Ion Ghica, 'Ochire asupra Științelor,' in Cornea, *Propășirea*, 431-439 & 446-455, 430-433 & 438-439. 'Științele în locul nostru sînt pănă acum într-atît de necunoscute…De aceea am rămas foarte înapoiați pe lîngă celelalte nații ale Europii și decît îndustria agricolă alta nu mai avem…' '…să nu se rușineze veacul.'
[90] Ion Ghica, 'Despre Importența Economiei Politice,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 138-149, 138-139. 'economia politică…singură numai este în stare să ne lumineze întru căutarea interesurilor noastre materiale și morale.'

all of its works to industry's laws, and the continent's sons living in other parts of the world and travelling by steam engine are the fastest means of communicating new ideas and discoveries from one people to another.' The progress of European civilisation and industry, he suggested, would see the European balance of power fall and be replaced by 'the happiness of the world.'[91] The balance of power concerned competing imperial and national interests. Progress would bring those interests into alignment.

It was only when progress became general that Wallachia and Moldavia could assume their places in the constellation of European civilisation, and the young liberals of the two principalities set about planning that future.[92] A group came together in 1844 to found a new magazine at Iași. Its commitment was clear from the proposed title: *Propășirea* (Progress).[93] The Moldavian censors preferred the more mundane *Foaie Științifică și Literară* (Scientific and Literary Gazette), but they did little to alter the magazine's content after the first issue.[94] The word *propășirea* appeared in several issues, and only one article—on criminal justice—featured an editorial disclaimer.[95] Its author, Atanasie Urianu, who was a judge on the Ilfov County Tribunal in Wallachia, had written in support of the death penalty as a punishment for murder, and a note informed readers that his opinion was not shared by the editors.[96] The ideological thrust of the magazine was liberal and progressive. Articles on political economy, education, agriculture, and science offered a coherent programme of reform to improve the two principalities, and more often than not, like their Polish and Hungarian contemporaries, the writers associated with *Propășirea* looked west to learn the lessons of civilisation. There was no perfect model of European civilisation. The contributors to *Propășirea* were intellectual

---

Ghica's lecture drew heavily on an earlier one delivered by Michel Chevalier at the Collège de France in April 1841. See Paul Cornea, 'Studiu Introductiv,', in Cornea, *Propășirea,* XXV.

[91] Ghica, 'Economiei Politice,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 146-147. 'Astăzi în toate puncturile globului munca se așază și industria își împlîntează steagul ei mai sus decît acela a războiului și a barbariei. Europa supune toate lucrările sale la legile ei, și fiii săi lăcuiesc celelalte părți a lumii; răpezile mijloace de comunicație vor face să treacă ideil și descoperirile de la un neam la altul cu iuțala aburului; atunci cuvîntul ecuilibrul Europei va per și se va înlocui prin zicerea fericirea lumei.'

[92] For a brief discussion of the idea of progress in a Transylvanian context, see Angela Harre, 'The Concept of *Progress:* The Fraught Relation between Liberalism and State Intervention', in Victor Neumann & Armin Heinen eds., *Key Concepts of Romanian History: Alternative Approaches to Socio-Political Language,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2013), 153-182.

[93] Facsimiles - both in the transitional and Latin alphabets - of every issue can be found at Cornea, *Propășirea.*

[94] Only one article was censored. It discussed a customs union for the two principalities. Negotiations for such a union had taken place in 1843, and the Moldavian ruler Mihail Sturdza was blamed when they broke down. The idea of a customs union wasn't objectionable. It was only the timing of the article, and its author—Ion Ghica—would go on to write about customs union in a subsequent issue. A union was approved in 1846 and went into force in January 1848. See Cornea, *Propășirea*, 705-706 Note 2.

[95] For an example of the use of the word *propășirea,* see Ion Ghica, 'Ochire asupra științelor,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 446-455. 'Astăzi nu e propășire fără științe.' (Today there is no progress without science.)

[96] Atanasie Urianu, 'Despre legislația criminală,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 671-683, 680-681. Urianu's article is unsigned, but I have no reason to doubt Paul Cornea's attribution of the article to him.

magpies. They weren't interested in replicating the social and economic structures of France or Britain or Prussia in their entirety. They sought the best example in each field of study, and they suggested ways that it could be adapted to the circumstances of the two principalities. Neither Belgium nor Germany, for instance, could provide a suitable example of agricultural development. Both were too densely populated to serve as models for the Danubian Principalities. The agricultural system of England seemed more appropriate.

The economies of Moldavia and Wallachia were overwhelmingly agrarian, and so agricultural development was a priority. Progress was made under the Organic Regulations. The Wallachian Interior Minister, Iordache Filipescu, had put together a project for improvement in 1832 that included the introduction of new agricultural technologies, and in Moldavia an agronomy section was added to the Society of Medics and Naturalists at Iași in 1834.[97] One of the most prominent advocates for agricultural improvement during the 1840s was the Moldavian Ion Ionescu de la Brad. He served as professor of agronomy at the Academia Mihaileană, and in 1844 he laid out his vision for the future agrarian order of the principalities. It was built upon the works of John Sinclair, Arthur Young, and the Board of Agriculture in England. Ionescu argued that the two principalities lacked three attributes: capital, manpower, and knowledge. The first two were difficult to address, but the right institutions could remedy ignorance. The impetus needed to come from the state. England's agricultural order was not built on private entrepreneurship alone. The 'most important public works,' wrote Ionescu, were 'performed by companies authorised by Parliament,' and the government itself spent 'great sums to establish and maintain model farms, as well as encouraging private enterprise.'[98] Model farms held a particular fascination for Ionescu, and he wasn't alone. Such institutions had existed in England since the 1760s, and the founder of agricultural theory in Russia, M.G. Pavlov, had established his own experimental farm in the late 1820s after studying with Arthur Young.[99] But the high point of model farm construction in England was only beginning when Ionescu published his essay. One-hundred-and-sixty-six model farms had been built between 1790 and 1820. A further 291 farms would appear from 1840 to 1870. Ionescu's plans for the Danubian Principalities were more modest. He

---

[97] Iordache, *Principatele Române,* I, 50.

[98] Ion Ionescu de la Brad, 'Îmbunătățirea în agricultura noastră,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 191-199, 239-247, 255-261, 271-275, 240-241. 'În Englitera, unde cele mai însemnate lucrări de bine public se fac de companii autorizate de parlament, vedem nu numai pe particulari întreprinzînd cele mai radicale îmbunătățiri agricole, ce și pe însași ocîrmuirea, care pe de o parte, cheltuiește sume mari pentru înființarea și ținerea fermelor modele, iar pe de alta, încurajînd chi ape particulari, îi răsplătește cu însemnătoare ajutoruri, precum se dovedește din gratificațiile date lucrărilor lui Maicle, Coke, Iung, Sincler și multor altora.'

[99] On model farms, see Susanna Wade Martins, *The English model farm: building the agricultural ideal, 1700-1914*, (Macclesfield: Windgather, 2002). I am indebted to Peter Mandler for pointing me in the direction of this book.

suggested that each state should endow two. They were not to be built near the capital cities, where they would be of only limited use, but in the regions with the greatest number of estates. One farm would act as a model for plains agriculture, and the other would offer guidance to farmers whose lands were in the mountainous terrains of the Carpathians.

Agricultural development had to bring together the interests of landowners and tenant farmers to guarantee success. The number of tenant farmers had expanded rapidly under the Organic Regulations. There were 246 tenant farmers with patents in Wallachia in 1831, but by 1835 that number had risen to over 700, and the expansion was just as rapid in Moldavia, too.[100] Many of these men took control of entire estates. Constantin Giurescu described them as 'agents of capitalism,' and their economic importance was clear from the sizeable amounts of money that changed hands. As early as 1833, Moldavian tenant farmers paid more than eight million lei in rent to landowners. This figure exceeded the state budget by almost two million lei.[101] But Ionescu believed the system was imperfect. Most contracts between farmers and landowners in the principalities were drawn up for a period of three years or fewer, and he considered this timescale inadequate. It dissuaded farmers from long-term planning. Five-year leases would be 'a step forward,' and nine even better, but Ionescu believed a term of at least twenty years would be best. 'The longer the lease on an estate,' he wrote, 'the more closely the interest of the tenant will align with that of the landowner.'[102] His proposal echoed the ideas of the eighteenth-century English agriculturalist Nathaniel Kent. 'Leases,' Kent wrote, 'are the first, the greatest and most rational encouragement that can be given to agriculture.'[103] The security of a long lease would lead tenant farmers to plan carefully rather than exploit the land for a quick profit. Progress would take time. Ionescu's reforms would not bear fruit overnight, but they had been proven in practice elsewhere in Europe.

A new agricultural order would bring economic prosperity to the Danubian Principalities, but better education was needed to plant the seeds of European civilisation. Dinicu Golescu had experimented with peasant education in the 1820s. He established a school on his estate at Goleşti and invited Florian Aaron to teach.[104] The school was short-lived, but the introduction of the Organic Regulations saw attempts to establish a new

---

[100] Vladimir Diculescu, *Bresle, negustori, şi meseriaşi în Ţara Românească (1830-1848)*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1973), 120.
[101] Constantin Giurescu, *Contribuţiuni la studiul originilor şi dezvoltării burgheziei române pînă la 1848*, (Bucharest: Editura ştiinţifică, 1972), 160-168. See chapter three below for more on the agricultural order of Wallachia.
[102] Ionescu, 'Îmbunătăţirea,' in Cornea, *Propăşirea,* 270-271. 'cu cît terminul arenduirei unei moşii va fi mai lung, cu atîta se identifiează mai mult interesul arendarului cu al proprietarului'
[103] Wade Martins, *English model farm,* 11-12.
[104] Drace-Francis, *Modern Romanian Culture,* 87.

framework for education in the two principalities.[105] The liberal circle around *Propășirea* were ardent supporters of public education. In his essay on the subject, Ion Ghica cited the Prussian Frederick the Great. 'Peasant education,' he wrote, 'is the most rapid and thorough medium of civilisation.'[106] He regarded the Prussian system as the best in Europe, praised the uniformity of German schools, and recommended translations of Friedrich Wilmsen's *Der deutsche Kinderfreund* and Johann Schwabe's *Lese und Lehrbuch für den Bedarf der Volkschule* as 'the best textbooks of useful knowledge' available to primary schoolchildren.[107]

Education needed to be both practical and moral. Ghica's plan reflected these two tendencies. Professors were to inspire their students with 'love of mankind and pleasant and useful occupations like gardening, cultivating trees, and raising livestock.' They would learn to speak 'plainly and judiciously' because 'after knowledge of religion and nature, nothing is more important for a man to know than how to express his ideas simply and precisely.' He recommended the establishment of four 'normal schools' that would teach these values and train students to become teachers for the smaller village schools. Students would learn reading, writing, religion, national history, geography, arithmetic, and music, as well as systems of measures and geometry 'for dividing land into *fălci, pogoane,* and *prăjini*.'[108] Ghica's schools would play an important role in the new agricultural order that his colleague Ion Ionescu had proposed. In the final instalment of his essay, Ghica referred to Ionescu's plans. When the model farms were established, he suggested, they should be 'near the normal schools so that teachers could visit them and take their agricultural knowledge back to the villages.'[109]

The young writers associated with *Propășirea* advocated a new economic framework for the two principalities that was based on European models. Anton Vincler's essay on usury argued the need for a proper banking system. Usury was both an economic and a moral

---

[105] See Nicoleta Roman, 'Școlile sătești din Țara Românească: începuturi, obstacole, și realizări (1831-1848)', in Cătălina Mihalache & Leonidas Rados eds, *Educația publică și condiționările sale (secolele XIX-XX)*, (Iași: Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza, 2015), 49-88.

[106] Ion Ghica, 'Însămnări asupra învățăturii publice (Despre învățătura publică),' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 35-41, 51-55, 171-175, 399-407, 415-419, 398-399. 'Frideric cel Mare, pătruns de adevărul că învățătura țărănească este mijlocul de civilizație cel mai repede și mai temeinic.'

[107] Ghica, 'învățăturii publice,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 172-173. '*Prietenul copiilor* a lui Wilmsen și *Cartea de cetire și învățătură* a lui Schwabe sînt socotite în Germania ca cele mai bune manuale de cunoștințe folositoare.'

[108] Ghica, 'învățăturii publice,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 404-405. 'profesorii trebuie să însufle tinerilor iubirea de oameni și de îndeletniciri plăcute și folositoare, precum grădinăra, cultura pomilor, creșterea vitelor &. În lecțiile lor să-I exerceze a vorbi lămurit și cu judecată, căci, după cunoștința religiei și a naturii, nimic nu este mai trebuincios omului decît a ști să-și exprime cu simplitate și exacteță ideile sale.' *Fălci, pogoane,* and *prăjini* are all units of measurements. A *falcă* is equivalent to 1.4323 hectures, a *pogon* to 0.5 hectares, and a *prăjină* to 180 square metres.

[109] Ghica, 'învățăturii publice,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 414-415. 'Cînd s-ar înființa ferme-modele, aceste să fie în aproprierea școlilor normale, căci ar fi de cel mai mare folos ca acești învățători să poată urma ades la acele ferme-modele, ca să ducă pe la sate cunoștințe de agricultură mai positive și mai întinse.'

problem, and it thrived in states where the people lacked ready access to capital. 'Only dire need,' wrote Vincler, 'could convince somebody to pawn their clothes, silverware, or other possessions.'[110] The introduction of a national bank, a system of commercial banks, and loan banks that accepted chattel as guarantee (mounts of piety) could overcome the harms caused by usury. These institutions were fundamental to the proper commercial and moral functioning of a society. 'Their need,' wrote Vincler, 'is felt in all the states of Europe, and today we do not find a state that does not have a bank.'[111] Wallachia and Moldavia were the unspoken exceptions. But it was not just the introduction of a banking system that would transform the economic prospects of the two principalities. A customs union was needed, too. In his article on the importance of political economy, Ion Ghica held up the German *Zollverein* as a model. He considered it the first step towards the creation of a new German state. 'The power and the genius of [the Holy Roman Emperor] Charles V couldn't create it,' he wrote, and 'the negotiators of the Treaty of Vienna talked about it as a dream…. Industry has created what neither fear, the skill of politicians, nor even force could do.' The German states had adopted common systems of money, weights and measures, and Ghica predicted that 'perhaps our generation will see a unified German state.'[112] He saw the same destiny for the two Danubian Principalities.[113] Economic alignment and gradual progress rather than the will of princes would bring national unification. Germany was a few steps ahead, and it offered a beacon.

European states provided shining examples for the future of the two Danubian Principalities, but the young liberals were just as keen to learn from their struggles, too. Pauperism was a serious problem across Europe. In France, the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences charged one of its members, the doctor Louis Villermé, with investigating the conditions of the working classes in 1835. His reports were bleak. He visited the rue d'Etaques, one of the most notorious slums of Lille, and found its poorest citizens living in cellars and attics. A municipal report from 1832 had described walls 'plastered with garbage' and beds made of 'a few dirty, greasy planks' and 'damp and putrescent straw.' But Villermé was most shocked by their moral degradation. He found people of all ages and both sexes

---

[110] A. Vincler, 'Despre Cămătărie,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 107-115, 110-111. 'numai o mare nevoie poate sili pe cineva să-și zălogească un strai, o arginteărie sau altceva'

[111] Vincler, 'Despre Cămătărie,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 110-111. 'Nevoia unor asemene instituturi s-au simțit la toate staturile Europei, încît astăzi nu găsim nici un stat care să nu-și aibă banc.'

[112] Ghica, 'Economiei Politice,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 138-141. '…puterea și geniul lui Carol al cincele nu putur nici într-un chip să o preacă; negoțiatorii Tractatului de la Viena au vorbit despre aceasta ca de un vis, o dorea, fără însă vreo nădejde. Industria a pus azi în fptă aceea ce nici frica, nici iscusința politicilor, nici sila nu ar fi putut-o întreprinde…poate că generația noastră va vedea staturile Germaniei unite'

[113] The customs union between Moldavia and Wallachia came into effect at the beginning of 1848.

'stacked together' on beds, and advised his reader that if he wished to imagine an accurate picture of the scene 'his imagination must not recoil before any of the disgusting mysteries performed on these impure beds, in the midst of obscurity and drunkenness.'[114] Poverty existed in the two Danubian Principalities, but it wasn't felt in the same way that it was in Manchester or Lille. 'Hundreds of years will pass,' wrote Mihail Kogălniceanu, 'before this plague of industrial society will be felt here.'[115] He doubted the problem would ever be as severe as it was in England, but still he recommended initiatives that would stave off the threat in the future. He looked to the French Revolution for guidance. 'No government,' wrote Kogălniceanu, 'has proposed better measures for the extirpation of beggary than the French National Assembly.'[116] His programme demonstrates the economic and moral character of the discourse of pauperism. The poor could be divided into the deserving and the undeserving. Those who needed help would receive it. Those who were indolent would be forced into work. He proposed a hospital for incurables, an orphanage, and a beggars' prison where feeble and old beggars would be given work that matched their abilities. Paid employment would be introduced in regular prisons so that prisoners 'wouldn't need to turn to begging or return to old habits' on their release. New measures were to be taken against venereal disease and alcohol, which 'much more than all other ills are the causes of poverty.' Winter work was to be found for artisans whose trade was seasonal, and a savings house would be established so diligent workers could set aside money in summer and withdraw it during the hard months of winter. He expected the adoption of these measures to face difficulties, but experience would help overcome them.[117] Kogălniceanu was planning for the long term.

Liberal plans under the Organic Regulations were oriented towards the future. *Propășirea* was suppressed in November 1844, and Ion Ghica complained that the decision to suspend it was 'completely arbitrary.' The magazine 'had no political leanings, it didn't attack the government, and its only problem was that it was very widespread and acquired a great

---

[114] For an account of Villermé's report, see William H. Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 223-232.

[115] Kogălniceanu's essay on Pauperism was inspired by a similar piece by the French liberal economist Adolphe-Gustave Blaise. It was pubished in 1845 in *Calendar pentru poporul românesc.* See Kogălniceanu, 'Despre Pauperism,' in Kogălniceanu, *Opere,* I, 572-577, 573. 'la noi încă sute de ani vor trece… înainte pînă cînd această plagă a straturilor industriale se va face simțitoare'

[116] Kogălniceanu, 'Despre Pauperism,' in Kogălniceanu, *Opere,* I, 575. 'Din toate ocîrmuirile nici una n-au propus mai bune măsuri spre a ajunge la stingerea caliciei decît Adunarea Națională a Franției'

[117] Kogălniceanu, 'Despre Pauperism,' in Kogălniceanu, *Opere,* I, 576. '4. Așezarea de muncă în inchisori, cu plată în favorul muncitorilor, ca așa inchișii, în zioa slobozirei lor, să aibă un mic capital, încît să nu fie siliți prin lipsă sau a cerșători, sau a se apuca de vechiul lor obicei.' '5. Măsuri energice spre stirpirea boalelor veneriane și a băuturilor spirtuoase, [sic] care, mai mult decît toate celelalte destrămări, sînt pricinuitoarele sărăciei.'

reputation in the two principalities.'[118] His reference to the magazine's lack of political leanings is revealing. The magazine hadn't concerned itself with present-day politics. Its focus was on the future improvement of the two principalities and the progress of European civilisation. These were not political considerations for Ghica. They belonged to a different temporal order. Politics was a subject for the present. Progress was a question of the future. It was the revolutionary wave that struck Europe in 1848 that brought the young liberals into the present.

Present

On 1 January 1848, the French weekly periodical *L'Illustration* published its predictions for the year ahead. January would see the return of a traveller from far-flung lands. He would tell incredible stories of his encounters with savages, and his account of his travels would be published at the expense of the state. In February, a savage would leave Paris and return to his homeland. He would describe for his fellows the 'grotesque promenade' of Mardi Gras, and they wouldn't believe him. March would bring dances, April the visit of a foreign ambassador to Longchamps, and May a procession of the National guard to the Tuileries Palace. In June, doctors would order their clients to take in the waters to provide a pretext for their own travels, and in July Paris would witness contests on the Seine to celebrate the eighteenth anniversary of the July Revolution of 1830.[119] But the July Monarchy did not reach maturity. King Louis-Philippe fled Paris in February and boarded a steamer bound for England on 2 March. He travelled in the guise of an Englishman and could only laugh when he was greeted at Newhaven by one Reverend Theyre Smith. He took out his passport and showed it around. The name he had travelled under was William Smith.[120]

Louis-Philippe's deposition meant the revolutionary celebrations of 1848 came early to Paris, and they did not mark the anniversary of a past event, but the dawn of a new present. The signs of its birth were apparent across Europe. In January, the young Wallachian Dumitru Brătianu spoke of its delivery to his peers at the Society of Romanian Students. 'Can

[118] Quoted in Cornea, 'Studiu Introductiv,' in Cornea, *Propășirea*, XVII. 'Ce fut là une mesure tout-à-fait arbitraire, car cette feuille n'avait aucune tendance politique, elle n'attaquait en rien la gouvernement, elle n'avait que l'inconvénient d'être très répandue et d'avoir acquis une grande réputation dans les deux Principautés.'
[119] *L'Illustration,* (Paris, 1843-1944), 1 January 1848.
[120] For an account of Louis-Philippe's escape, see Walter K. Kelly, *Narrative of the French Revolution of 1848,* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1848), 114-122.

we have only memories and aspirations,' he asked, before turning his attention to the present. He urged his audience 'not to fear the word present…There are men,' he said, 'who say that the present is an illusion, that we should seek only the future and not occupy ourselves with the present, that mankind has only a past and a future, and that the present doesn't exist.' Brătianu decried this attitude as 'Sophism.' There could be no past or future without the present, and events across Europe had woken it up. The people of the Danubian Principalities had to take note. He asked his friends whether they had heard the echoing voices from Italy and Switzerland carrying across the Apennines and the Alps. He pointed to movements in Styria, Sicily, and Bohemia, and he spoke of Croatia, where 'the women break their necklaces and tear off their jewels to throw to the deputies, demanding their national language: the Croat language.' He looked to Palermo, where 'the smell of gunpowder rejuvenates the old, arms the young, and makes men of the women, where every bomb blows up a battalion of heroes.' In Naples, he said, on the Via Toledo 'a man of the people demands of the soldier who beats him "why do you hit me? Are we not brothers?"' The two men embrace, and 'in the heat of that embrace, the iron sceptre of Neapolitan tyranny melts.' In Turin, Genoa, Florence, Pisa, Livorno, Ferrara, Bologna, and Rome the Italians organised national guards and proclaimed the liberty and unity of Italy, and in Switzerland 'a handful of men defies all Europe…[and] when the Great Powers turn their rifles upon them, those twelve free voices in the Assembly at Berne disarm and shame them all.' Like Friedrich Julius Stahl in his lecture on revolution, Brătianu spoke in the present tense. He described every event as though it were happening at that very moment. How could he and his peers not occupy themselves with the present 'today, when all of mankind enters into a struggle that was unknown in past times?'[121] Rome had united Europe in antiquity, Christianity in the medieval era, and now revolution united it in the nineteenth century.

[121] The speech was published by Brătianu's friend C.A. Rosetti in *Pruncul Român* in July. Rosetti dated the speech to late 1847, but several of the events that Brătianu described in the course of his speech didn't take place until January 1848. For the full speech, see *Anul 1848,* I, 61-73, 68-69. 'Voiu să vă întreb, dacă noi nu putem avé decât suvenire, aspirații….cuvîntul present să nu vă sperie… sînt oameni cari zic că presentul este o ilusie, că să căutăm numai viitorul, că să nu ne ocupăm de present, că omenirea nu are decât trecut și viitor, că presentul nu există. Sofism! … astăzi…omenirea întreagă intră într'o frămîntare necunoscută vremilor trecute…în Croația damele își rup salbele, își smulg podoabele capetelor lor și le aruncă deputaților, cari reclamă limba națională. Limba croată! … în Palermo, unde mirosul prafului de pușcă întineria pe bătrâni, înarma pe copii, îmbărbăția femeile, unde din norul fiește-căreia bombe săria un batalion de eroi… vedem sceptrul de fer al tiranului Neapolului topindu-se la căldura unei îmbrățișări - ați auzit-o - în ulița Toledului un ofițer lovesce un om al popolului, omul popolului îi strigă: De ce mă lovesci? Nu sîntem frați? Ofițerul sare de pe cal, se aruncă în brațele lui, frățesc se îmbrățișează, electrismul frăției se comunică din om în om… vedem în Elveția o mână de oameni defiind Europea întreagă și cele dintâi Puteri ale Europei strigă, ieau armele, întind pușcile asupră-le și în camera de la Bern două-spre-zece glasuri libere le desarmă, le rușinează pe toate.'

The speed with which the convulsions of the present struck the continent were captured in many contemporary metaphors for the spread of revolution. The French Revolution of 1789 had caught people by surprise. Peter Fritzsche has argued that it brought a new and 'explosive sense of time as something sudden, thunderous, and clandestine,' but this was not an immediate realisation. Fritzsche gives the example of the Brandenburg aristocrat Alexander von der Marwitz. He wrote to his lover Rahel Varnhagen at the end of 1812. 'Lightning strikes the soul, omens reveal themselves, and ideas drift through time [and] like the mysterious appearances of ghosts point to a deeper meaning, the revolution of all things, in which *everything* Old disappears like the ground pulled under by an earthquake, while underneath the ruins volcanoes heave up a new and fresh ground.'[122] There is a sense of uncertainty in Marwitz's remarks. Lightning might strike the soul, but ideas *drift* through time, and the volcanoes that churn up the new and fresh ground are unseen. The present of the French Revolution was difficult to grasp, but by the mid-nineteenth century people understood the script, and it was accelerating.[123] After the July Revolution of 1830, the Austrian statesman Prince Klemens von Metternich had quipped that 'when France sneezes, Europe catches cold,' but a cold takes several days to incubate. The metaphors of 1848 were more immediate. An attendee at a popular assembly at Mannheim in February remarked that 'one idea flashes through Europe [and] the old system shakes and falls into pieces.' The Romantic composer Richard Wagner described Europe as 'a huge volcano,' but unlike Marwitz's volcano, Wagner's erupted in the atmosphere and could be seen across the continent. 'The sublime Goddess of revolution,' he wrote, 'rages on the wings of the storms.'[124] The spread of revolution might not have been as sudden as these images suggested, but it was imagined that way during the Springtime of Peoples.[125] It had taken years for the present to cross Europe after 1789. In 1848 it seemed to happen in an instant.

Planning for a revolution in the Danubian Principalities began in the immediate aftermath of events in Paris in February, but disagreements between the Moldavians and Wallachians led the two parties to pursue their separate causes. Romanian historians have often overestimated the connections between the Moldavian and Wallachian Revolutions of 1848. They link them with events in Transylvania to present the story of how Romania

[122] Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present,* 30-31.
[123] See, for instance, Bălcescu's letter quoted in the introduction.
[124] Both quoted in Körner, 'The European Dimension', 15.
[125] See chapter 4 for a discussion of the 'imperfect synchronicities' of 1848.

became Romania.[126] But contemporaries recognised the differences. An anonymous account that was found among the papers of the Moldavian Nicolae Suțu contrasted the two movements. The Wallachian manifesto abolished the Organic Regulations. The Moldavian one called for their strict observance. In Wallachia, the revolutionary movement was the work of 'young men and especially the inferior classes'. In Moldavia, the 'Regulatory movement' was promoted by 'the highest classes of society… the eldest and most notable persons, with the Metropolitan and the clergy at their head.'[127] The divisions in Paris were just as apparent. The Wallachians Dumitru and Ion Brătianu refused to participate in a meeting hosted by the Moldavian Iancu Alecsandri because they considered him too moderate. When discussions turned to a joint revolutionary movement, Nicolae Bălcescu and Christian Tell advocated Wallachia first and Moldavia second. The Moldavians thought simultaneous uprisings would have a greater chance of success.[128] No agreement was reached, and the two parties went their own ways. The Moldavian movement fizzled out within a few days in April after Prince Sturdza arrested many of its ringleaders, and those who escaped went into exile in Austrian Czernowitz. The 'young men' and 'inferior classes' of Wallachia enjoyed more success.

The Organic Regulations provided a framework for progress, but they couldn't serve as the basis for revolution. The difference between progress and revolution was a temporal one. The two concepts were not mutually exclusive. Progress was an economic and moral corrective. It promised gradual improvement and a future in which people were better educated and more prosperous. Revolution was a matter of politics. It related to the distribution of power, and power could only be exercised in the present. 'Democracy,' as Alexander Herzen would write in December 1848, 'is essentially the present.'[129] Progress was meant to avert political crisis. Kiselev worked to improve the material wellbeing of the people, but his reforms did nothing to increase their political power. His political objective, according to Alexander Bitis, was to create 'an aristocratic constitution, weighted heavily in favour of the first-class boyars upon whom Russia hoped to base its influence in the region.'[130] Progress would ensure the stability of that new regime by eliminating economic grievances,

---

[126] See, for instance, Berindei, *Revoluția Română,* Stan, *Revoluția Română,* Iscru, *Revoluția română,* and Bodea, *Lupta românilor.*

[127] BAR, Documente Istorice 52/DCCV. 'Par le manifeste du 11 Juin le réglement a été aboli a Bucarest comme étant préjudiciable aux intérêts du pays ; par la manifestation du 28 Mars qui eût lieu à Jassi, la stricte observation du règlement a été demandée comme étant le seul moyen de faire cesser les abus que commettait le prince Michel Stourdza. En Valachie le mouvement révolutionnaire a été fait par des jeunes gens et surtout par les classes inférieures, tandis qu'en Moldavie le mouvement réglementaire a été fait par les plus hautes classes de la société, par les plus vieux et plus marquants personnages ayant en tête le Métropolitain et le clergé'

[128] Bodea, *Lupta românilor*, 107-109.

[129] Herzen, *From the Other Shore,* 88.

[130] Bitis, *Russia and the Eastern Question,* 442.

but the proceeds of progress were not evenly distributed. The harsh labour conditions of the Wallachian peasantry and the harvest failures that were common to Europe in the years preceding the revolution placed a strain on those 'inferior classes' who would embrace the revolution.[131]

Popular sovereignty was at the heart of the revolutionary proclamation promulgated outside the Wallachian village of Islaz on 21 June. The Islaz Proclamation was the founding document of the Wallachian revolutionary movement, and it became the principality's constitution when it was accepted by Prince Gheorghe Bibescu at Bucharest two days later. It derived its authority from the Wallachian people. They stood out at the top of the document, separated from the main body of the text and in a larger font. 'In the name of the Wallachian People,' the proclamation began. They had 'awakened at the call of the redeeming angel's trumpet, and recognised their sovereign right.'[132] As Nicolae Liu has noted, the proclamation's language reflected that of the first address of the French Provisional Government. It too spoke 'in the name of the French people,' and both documents emphasised respect for persons and property.[133] These were the twin ideological pillars of the revolution, and they marked it as the work of all the people, not the many or the few. 'All Wallachians,' the Proclamation continued 'are called to this great salvation. None are excluded; every Wallachian is an atom of the sovereignty of the entire people. Every peasant, artisan, merchant, priest, soldier, student, boyar, prince, is a son of his country…is a son of God.' The revolution was for 'the good and the happiness of all classes of society, without prejudice to any single individual.'[134] And the importance of popular sovereignty was

---

[131] See chapter 3 for the condition of the Wallachian peasantry. On economic struggles across Europe, see Helge Berger & Mark Spoerer, 'Economic Crises and the European Revolutions of 1848', *The Journal of Economic History*, 61.2 (2001), 293-326.

[132] Copies were printed in both Romanian and French. For the Romanian edition, see Archives diplomatiques - Centre de Nantes, Nantes (CAD), 166PO/E/168. Text also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* I, 490-501. For a copy in French, see The National Archives, Kew (TNA), Foreign Office Papers, 78/742, 160-164 or BAR, Doc Ist, DCCCX/143. 'În numele popolului Român….popolul Român se deșteaptă la glasul trâmbiței îngerului Mântuirii și își cunoaște dreptul său de suveran.'/'Au nom du Peuple Valaque …le Peuple Valaque se réveille au son de la trompette de l'ange rédempteur, et reconnaît son droit de souverain.'

[133] Nicolae Liu, 'Mentalite revoluționară și cultură modernă: Contacte și consonanțe româno-franceze la 1848', *Revista Istorică*, IV (1993), 999-1014. Keith Hitchins has also noted the similarities between the liberal ideology of the French revolutionaries of 1848 and those of Wallachia. See Keith Hitchins, 'Romanian Liberalism (1821-1866)', in Victor Neumann & Armin Heinen eds., *Key Concepts of Romanian History: Alternative Approaches to Socio-Political Language,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2013), 107-130.

[134] CAD, 166PO/E/168 & TNA, FO 78/742, 160r. 'La această mare faptă a Mântuirii, tot Românul are dreptul de a fi chemat, nimeni nu este scos afară; tot Românul e un atom al întregii suveranități a popolului: sătean, meserian, negușător, preot, soldat, student, boer, Domn, e fiu al patriei…e fiu al lui Dumnezeu…Scularea aceasta e pentru binele, pentru fericirea tutulor stărilor soțietății, fără paguba vre-uneia, fără paguba însăși a nici unei persoane'/'A cette grande œuvre de salut tout Valaque est convié, aucun n'en est exclus. Tout Valaque est un atôme de la grande souveraineté du Peuple ; habitant des campagnes, artisan, marchand, prêtre, soldat, étudiant, boïer, prince, chacun est fils de la Patrie…il est fils de Dieu…Ce

reiterated with every new issue of the revolutionary government's official organ: *Popolul Suveran* (The Sovereign People).

The Islaz Proclamation connected popular sovereignty to the history of the principality. It couched the revolutionary mission in terms of redemption and regeneration and connected the sovereign rights of the people and the administrative and legislative independence of the country to medieval treaties contracted between the principality's medieval rulers and the Ottoman Empire. These treaties were almost certainly eighteenth-century fabrications, but they provided a historical context for the politics of the present, and the people did, too.[135] In July 1820, the French historian Augustin Thierry wrote a series of articles in which he argued that the emergence of popular politics required a new form of history. 'The better part of our annals,' he wrote, 'the most instructive part, remains to be written; the history of the citizens, the subjects, the public, the masses, is missing.'[136] Bălcescu's history of the ploughmen had attempted to fill that gap in the Wallachian context, and the Islaz Proclamation drew on his ideas. It spoke to 'the poor, the peasants, the ploughmen, feeders of the cities, true sons of the country… who bore all the burdens of the country, [and] who worked and improved the fields for centuries.' The people were responsible for the principality's prosperity, and they deserved their share in it. Article thirteen offered them 'a little piece of land, enough to feed their family and livestock, a little piece paid over the centuries with their sweat.'[137] The revolution was the repayment of the past. Sovereignty originated with the colonisation of the land; in other words, it was a European phenomenon.

But the proper exercise of popular sovereignty required a new liberal order. The Islaz Proclamation sought to turn people into citizens. Land for the peasants was only one part of this programme. The proclamation mandated equal justice before the law, political representation for all, and a general taxation based on income. Ranks and titles were abolished, all children of both sexes were to be given free access to education, and freedom of speech, association, and the press were guaranteed. 'Truth, ideas, and knowledge,' were 'the

---

soulèvement se fait pour le bien-être, pour le bonheur de toutes les classes de la société, sans porter préjudice à un seul individu.'

[135] See Viorel Panaite, 'The Legal and Political Status of Wallachia and Moldavia in relation to the Ottoman Porte,' in Gábor Kármán and Lovro Kunčević, *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 9-42.

[136] Quoted in Aileen Kelly, *Discovery of Chance,* 95.

[137] CAD, 166PO/E/168 & TNA, FO 78/742, 161r. 'Săracii, sătenii, plugarii, hrănitori orașelor, fiii patriei cei adevărați…ce au purtat toate greutățile țării, prin munca lor de atâtea veacuri au lucrat moșiile și le-au îmbunătățit…își ccer o părticică de pământ îndestulă pentru hrana familiei și vitelor sale, părticică răscumpărată de atâtea veacuri cu sudorile lor.'/'Les pauvres, les habitants des campagnes, les laboureurs qui nourrissent les villes, vrais fils de la Patrie…ont supporté tous les fardeaux de l'état; ils ont prodigué leur travail depuis tant de siècles pour cultiver, pour améliorer la terre…ils demandent au nom de la Justice, au nom de la Patrie une parcelle de cette terre qu'ils ont payée avec la sueur de tant de siècles.'

property of everybody.' They were 'like the air, the sun, and the water.' To 'drown the truth, to extinguish the light, to impede the public good through the obstruction of the press' was 'a crime against the country, a sacrilege against God.' The only people who were hurt by the free exchange of information were 'the sons of darkness.'[138] Keith Hitchins described it as a 'characteristic programme of the European liberal intellectuals of 1848,' but it went further than many.[139] Some European liberals viewed liberalism as incompatible with democracy. The common people would pose a radical threat to the liberal order, as they did during the June Days in Paris, which drove many French liberals into the arms of the Party of Order.[140] But the connection between popular politics and liberal institutions like the press would come to be widely understood across Europe in the wake of 1848. The Prussian Minister-President Otto von Manteuffel wrote in July 1851 that every century had 'seen new cultural forces enter into the sphere of traditional life, forces which were not to be destroyed but to be incorporated.' For his generation, he wrote, the press was 'such a force. Its significance has grown with the expanded participation of the people in public affairs, a participation that is partly expressed, partly fed and directed by the press.'[141] Eight months after Manteuffel wrote these words in a letter to the former Prussian Interior Minister Adolf Rochus von Rochow, his fellow conservative Friedrich Julius Stahl delivered his speech on revolution to the Evangelical Association for Ecclesiastical Aims in Berlin. 'Revolution,' he said, 'demands popular sovereignty…Revolution demands freedom…Revolution demands equality.'[142] Stahl did not agree with the revolution's aims or methods, but he understood its nature. Its liberal order was founded upon popular politics and the sovereignty of the people.

Popular sovereignty did not interfere with Ottoman suzerainty. The geopolitical context of the revolution in Wallachia was unique in the year 1848. The principality was subject to two foreign imperial powers without being a constituent part of either. Since the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829, the principality had been under Russian protection, but it was also a

---

[138] CAD, 166PO/E/168 & TNA, FO 78/742, 160r. 'Adevărul, ideile, cunoștințele vin de la Dumnezea, în folosul general al oamenilor, ca soarele, ca aerul, ca apa, și prin urmare sînt proprietate universală…a îneca adevărul, a stinge luminile, a împedeca foloasele, pn împedecarea tiparului, este o vânzare către patrie, o apostasie către Dumnezeu. Libertatea tiparului nu poate păgubi pe nimeni decât pe fii întunereculuiʼ/'La vérité, les idées, les connaissances viennent de Dieu pour le bonheur de la société et sont comme l'air, le soleil, l'eau la propriété de tous…Mettre un voile sur la vérité, un obstacle au développement des lumières si utiles à tous, en interdisant les publications de la presse, c'est un crime de lèse-Patrie, une apostasie contre le Seigneur. La liberté de la presse ne peut nuire qu'aux fils de l'Enfer.'

[139] Hitchins, *The Romanians,* 241.

[140] On the June Days, see Mark Traugott, *Armies of the Poor: Determinants of Working-Class Participation in the Parisian Insurrection of June,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985).

[141] Quoted in Clark, *Time and Power,* 137.

[142] Friedrich Julius Stahl, 'What is the Revolution?' [1852], in Jonathan Sperber ed., *From Vörmarz to Prussian Dominance, 1815-1866,* [http://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/4_P_O_Stahl_What is the Revolution.pdf accessed 15 May 2019]

vassal state of the Ottoman Empire, and it continued to pay tributes to the Porte in Constantinople. The revolution made no attempt to alter this geopolitical landscape. Fealty to the Porte was stressed in all diplomatic relations, and the Islaz Proclamation was clear that sovereignty was a question of interior—and not exterior—politics. 'The Wallachian People,' it said, wanted to 'maintain their administrative independence, their legislative independence, their sovereign right in all that concerns their interior,' but they also wanted to 'maintain their close link with the Imperial Porte.'[143] This loyalty to the Ottomans was widely understood. In his account of the outbreak of revolution in Bucharest, the Transylvanian schoolteacher Florian Aaron wrote that the Wallachians would 'continue to support the Porte and pay the tribute,' and that Russia would 'protect us when the Turks upset us… and we will suffer nobody to meddle in our administration.'[144] His prediction proved fanciful. By the end of September, the geopolitics of the principality had consumed its revolution.[145]

History occurred in the past and progress belonged to the future, but revolution happened in the present, and it belonged to the people. The tide of European events had emboldened the young liberals of Wallachia.[146] Their pre-revolutionary writings focussed on the national past and future. The glories of Wallachian and Moldavian history were connected to the idea of European civilisation, and the development of the two principalities would have to adapt European models to their specific needs. Some political figures—as Koselleck suggested—might have seen evolution as a means to avert revolution, but the Wallachian case demonstrates that these two concepts were not ideologically opposed. The revolutionary programme included several measures—the introduction of free education, for instance, or the abolition of corporal and capital punishment and their replacement with a system of correctial penitentiaries—that were meant to effect moral progress. But it provided a new political context for those developments. Evolution was understood in economic and moral terms. Revolution was a political act. The idea of the European Springtime of Peoples captured the revolution's character. Historians have tended to view this phrase through the

---

[143] CAD, 166PO/E/168 & TNA, FO 78/742, 160r. 'Popolul Român voește cu o voință tare a-și păstra neatârnarea administrației sale, neatârnarea legiurii sale, dreptu său suveran în cele dun năuntru și rămâne în aceleași legături, și mai strânse, prin luminile veacului, c. Î. Poarta.'/'Le Peuple Valaque a la ferme volonté de conserver l'indépendance de son administration et de sa législation, son droit souverain dans l'intérieur du pays, et veut rester toujours dans le mêmes obligations vis à vis de la Sublime Porte.'

[144] Aaron to Bariț, 12/24 June 1848, reproduced in Pascu, *George Bariț,* I, 69. 'Înaltei Porți îi vom rămînea credincioși, îi vom plăti tributul; Rusia ne va protegia cînd turcii ne vor supăra, și cînd noi nu vom fi în stare de a ne apăre, dar in administrația dinlăuntru a țării nu vom suferi ca să se amestice nimini. Constituția proclamată ieri va fi un adevăr, și noi vom ști a muri pentru dînsa. Să trăiască românii!!.'

[145] For a full discussion of the geopolitics of the revolution, see chapter 4.

[146] It had a similar effect on many liberals of the period. See, for instance, the Hungarian Lajos Kossuth, whose transition from liberal reformer to revolutionary was described by István Déak. See István Déak, 'Lajos Kossuth's Nationalism and Internationalism', *Austrian History Yearbook* 12 (1976), 48-52.

lens of national politics. Mike Rapport described it as 'a name pregnant with the liberating hopes of the early weeks of the revolutions, when national aspirations suddenly seemed possible.'[147] But it could also be understood in the sense of the people as the masses. The revolution brought them into the political arena, which was understood as the time of the present, and its proclamations were grounded in their sovereignty. They were issued in the name of the Wallachian people. This intellectual shift didn't negate the need for moral and economic progress in Wallachia and Moldavia. Both were required, but the events of 1848 offered the chance to place that evolutionary process in a new popular and revolutionary political framework. To borrow a metaphor from nineteenth-century science, prior to February 1848 the young liberals were Neptunists who believed that the future would form gradually through crystallisation. The European Springtime of Peoples gave the Wallachians a new appreciation for Vulcanism. Its fires burned in the present.

[147] Rapport, *1848,* 112.

II. Revolution in Bucharest

The revolution reached Bucharest two days after the Islaz Proclamation of 21 June, overthrowing the principality's political order and turning its inhabitants into political actors. Much had happened across Europe in the four months since the people of Paris stormed the Tuileries Palace. Klemens von Metternich had resigned from office in Vienna on 13 March, and a little more than a week later Josef Radecký and his Austrian forces were driven out of Milan. The city's inhabitants wept with joy, and 'peoples unknown to each other were seen embracing like brothers.' Even the more serious characters of the city could be found 'leaping and singing in the public thoroughfares.'[1] Barricades had gone up in Berlin and in Munich, Lajos Batthyány had formed a new Hungarian government, and in May the 649 parliamentarians of the German Confederation had gathered in the red sandstone Paulskirche in Frankfurt am Main. Authorities in Bucharest watched events with a rising sense of unease, and Prince Gheorghe Bibescu found himself caught between the competing philosophies of his Ottoman suzerain and his Russian protector. The one power favoured reform to stave off the revolutionary threat. The other preferred harsher measures. Bibescu tried both alternately, but to no avail.

Summer brought the scenes of Milan to Bucharest and inaugurated a new era in which the city's populace participated in the principality's politics. The revolution arrived on the same day that the French Executive Commission in Paris announced the closure of the *Ateliers Nationaux,* lighting the touchpaper of the June Days, but nobody in Bucharest knew of this unhappy coincidence. News didn't travel so quickly, and the city was absorbed in its own revolutionary fervour. Crowds began to gather at seven o'clock in the evening, one hour after the departure of the Russian General Duhamel for Leova in Moldavia.[2] In the commercial district of Lipscani somebody raised the national tricolour—blue, yellow, red—and the Islaz Proclamation was read aloud.[3] Men and women wearing cockades thronged the city streets. They came on foot and in carriages, and when rumours spread that thousands of peasants were descending upon the capital the citizens rushed out to meet them. They hugged. They

---

[1] Enrico Dandolo, *The Italian volunteers and Lombard Rifle Brigade: being an authentic narrative of the organization, adventures, and final disbanding of these corps, in 1848-1849 / by Emilio Dandolo; translated from the edition published at Turin in 1849; to which are added original letters and important historical documents relating to the late Italian movement of reform,* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851).

[2] Hory to Bastide, 24 June 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168.

[3] Taken from the account of Costache Steriadi before the Commission to Investigate Those Implicated in the 1848 Revolution. See Arhivele Naționale ale României, Bucharest (ANIC), Comisia alcătuită pentru cercetarea celor amestecați în fapte revoluționare de la 1848, 601/12/1849 4v.

kissed. They waved copies of the proclamation and united their voices to cry 'Justice!' Nobody worried about cholera, which was still rife in the countryside. Together the people of the city and countryside processed towards Bibescu's palace, and he received them from his balcony. He promised to meet all their demands, and voices rose from the crowd chanting 'Down with the Old Government!' A list of new ministers was passed up to Bibescu. Tricolour flags fluttered throughout the city and cries of 'Long Live the Constitution!' carried through the night, accompanied by the ringing of every church bell in the city.[4] It would have been impossible to sleep through it all. The sounds of the celebrations would have been audible for miles, for there were, according to J.H. Skene, 'so many churches at Bucharest that the devout may pray in a different one every day of the year, even if it be a leap-year.'[5]

The mood in Bucharest was reminiscent of that seen in many other European capitals during the spring, but the streets themselves bore little resemblance. At the turn of the nineteenth century, Bucharest resembled a 'large village' more than a European city.[6] William Wilkinson described an 'extensive dirty town, situated on a low and marshy ground.' It charmed from a distance, 'like the fine scenery of a theatre,' but up close it revealed itself to be little more than 'a coarse daub.'[7] Some improvements were made under the Organic Regulations. The Russian administrator Pavel Kiselev established a commission in March 1830 to develop and beautify the city, and the following year the local administration was reorganised, dividing Bucharest's seventy-eight neighbourhoods into five administrative districts. A new elected government took office in December 1831 to support commercial activity and ensure the city was supplied with essentials like bread, salt, and meat. It was elected on a limited franchise—only men over twenty-five and in possession of 5,000 lei could vote—but it still worked for the broader public interest. Plots of land were rented and later bought to establish new markets across the city, and the first efforts to pave the city's streets were made. Some 16,095 square fathoms of the city had been covered in stone by 1837, although many of the slabs were defective and crumbled. The city authorities made do with poorly cut wooden beams for streets of lesser importance, and sewage canals ran beneath them. The French poet and traveller Eugène Stanislas Bellanger was unimpressed when he visited in 1836. He found the streets to be 'very long, narrow, twisting, and dirty year-round,' and he complained that the drainage canals that ran beneath them for the 'discharge of the

[4] This account of events comes from Florian Aaron's letter to George Barițiu, 12/24 June 1848, reproduced in Ștefan Pascu & Iosif Pervain eds., *George Barițiu și contemporanii săi*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1973-), 8 vols, vol I, 66-69.
[5] J.H. Skene, *The Danubian Principalities, The Frontier Lands of the Christian and the Turk. By a British Resident of Twenty Years in the East*, (London: Richard Bentley, 1854), third edition, 2 vols, vol I, 335.
[6] Georgescu, 'Probleme de urbanism', 35.
[7] Wilkinson, *Account of the Principalities*, 86 & 90.

filth, water, and rains of the city' were improperly lined and often blocked by landslides. The smell was unbearable in summer.[8] It can't have been helped in the evening by the lighting of the city's streetlamps. The number of lanterns had increased from 280 in 1833 to around 700 by 1840, and most burned a low quality fish oil. Still, at least the light made it possible to see the cracks in the pavement.[9]

Ruin and disaster were never far from the streets of Bucharest. The eighteenth-century infrastructure that supplied the city with fresh drinking water was crumbling by the beginning of the Organic Regulations era, and poor public sanitation and hygiene provided a fertile breeding ground for cholera. Some two thousand people died when the second global pandemic struck the city in 1831.[10] In his memoirs, the Oltenian-born soldier Grigore Lăcusteanu recalled the fear that gripped the city during the summer and the grisly scenes that the epidemic produced. He was only eighteen at the time and fresh from military school, and one day he decided to take a picnic out to Herăstrău to the north of the city. But after unfurling his blanket he noticed a lump in the ground. He reached his hand underneath the blanket and found a hat, and when he pulled back the blanket he saw 'the head of one dead from cholera, buried too shallow in the earth.'[11] A new system of pumps was inaugurated in the autumn of 1847 to provide drinking water to the wealthy houses and public fountains along Podul Mogoșoaiei and Șosea, but it did little to avert a second outbreak of cholera in 1848.[12] As Richard Evans has shown, it was most often the poorest segments of society that were worst affected.[13] Disease was not the only threat to the city. Little was done to mitigate flooding from the Dâmbovița River. A third of the city was inundated when its banks burst in

---

[8] Eugène Stanislas Bellanger, *Le Kéroutza, voyage en Moldo-Valachie,* (Paris: Libraire Française et Étrangère, 1846), 2 vols, II, 13. 'Les rues, en majeure partie privées de noms, sont longues, étroites, tortueuses, et, en toute saison, malpropres. En 1836, bien petit était le nombre de celles qui avaient pu obtenir d'être pavées ; les autres étaient recouvertes, transversalement, de madriers à peine équarris… larges poutres sous lesquelles on avait creusé des canaux destinés à l'écoulement des immondices de la ville, des eaux ménagères et des pluies. Mais la terre de ces canaux n'étant maintenue par aucun revêtement, il en résultait des éboulements qui entravaient la marche des eaux, et alors, croupissant en peu de jours, ces eaux exhalaient, durant les chaleurs, des miasmes fétides.'

[9] On all the changes that took place in Bucharest during the Organic Regulations, see Georgescu, 'Probleme de urbanism'; Dan Berindei, 'Bucureștii în perioada 1822-1848', in Florian Georgescu et al. eds., *Istoria Orașului București*, (Bucharest: Muzeul de Istorie a Orașului București, 1965), 180-203; Florian Georgescu, 'Realizări edilitare în Bucureștii anilor 1831-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, IV (1966), 87-122; Florian Georgescu, 'Aspecte privind împărțirea administrativă și evoluția demografică din Bucureștii anilor 1831-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, III (1966), 53-88.

[10] Iordache, *Principatele române*, 51.

[11] Grigore Lăcusteanu, *Amintirile Colonelului Lăcusteanu*, (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2015), 65. 'într-o altă zi, pe câmpul Herăstrăului, făceam bivuacul de prânz; mie îmi făcuse culcușul, ca să zic așa, pe muchia unei văi; îmi așterne covorul, îmi pune perna de piele, mă trântesc, văz căpătâiul prea înalt; bag mâna sub covor, trag o pălărie Românească; ardic covorul, era capul unui mort de holeră îngropat prea puțin în pământ.'

[12] Podul Mogoșoaiei is today's Calea Victoriei and Șosea today's Șoseaua Kiseleff.

[13] See Richard J. Evans, 'Epidemics and Revolutions: Cholera in Nineteenth-Century Europe', *Past & Present* 120 (1988), 123-146.

1839, but a far worse disaster struck in April 1847: the Great Fire of Bucharest. It began during the celebrations of Orthodox Easter, and according to the British consul R.G. Colquhoun it killed thirty-nine people and destroyed close to two thousand houses and thirteen churches. The direction of the winds meant that the city's merchant population was worst affected. Many lost the contents of their warehouses, and those bankers who managed to recover their specie often found it 'in a solid fused mass.' The total damages ran to some £2,500,000, and repairs were slow in coming.[14] A public subscription raised some of the cost of rebuilding, but many wealthy boyars—whose homes were left relatively unscathed by the fire—were as reluctant to support the city's regeneration as they had been when Kiselev proposed a tax on property to pay for his improvements. Colquhoun considered the new buildings that replaced the old ones to be 'a very visible improvement' in both 'style and solidity,' but his successor J.H. Skene found much still to be done when he arrived in 1850.[15] He saw many 'ruined houses…with their blackened walls and fallen beams half consumed as they were left by the conflagration, and in some places great open spaces…where thickly peopled streets and lanes once stood.'[16]

Bucharest's population boomed despite epidemics and natural disasters. The city was home to around 30,000 people in the late eighteenth century, but by 1831 the population had risen to almost 60,000 settled residents with an additional floating population of between ten and twelve thousand. The population would double again to around 120,000 souls over the next thirty years. Artisans and merchants formed the bulk of the city's inhabitants.[17] In 1832 these 'middle classes' accounted for around 45,000 people.[18] They practised a variety of trades. Food, textile and clothing, and leather work were the most common, but there were also silversmiths and goldsmiths and various woodworkers.[19] Many of city's merchants and tradesmen were not of Wallachian origin. The Bible Society Agent Benjamin Barker encountered a range of nationalities during his visit in 1834. The shopkeepers were Greek, Bulgarian, Armenian, Jewish, and Moldavian, and Germans, Transylvanians, and

---

[14] Details taken from Colquhoun's reports to Palmerston in London and Wellesley in Constantinople. See Colquhoun to Palmerston, 5 April 1847. TNA, FO 78/697, 32-34, Colquhoun to Palmerston, 12 April 1847, TNA, FO 78/697, 35-37 & Colquhoun to Wellesley, 9 April 1847. TNA, FO 78/697, 38-39. For a historical study of the fire, see Florian Georgescu, 'Focul cel Mare din Martie 1847', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie* VII (1969), 55-66.
[15] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 14 September 1847. TNA, FO 78/697, 92r.
[16] Skene, *The Danubian Principalities,* I, 213.
[17] Peasants were also common in Bucharest and other cities in Southeastern Europe. For a discussion of the peasant urbanites in Serbia, see Andrei Simić, *The Peasant Urbanites: A Study of Rural-Urban Mobility in Serbia*, (New York: Seminar Press, 1973).
[18] Constantin Giurescu, *Istoria Bucureștilor din cele mai vechi timpuri pînă în zilele noastre,* (București: Editura pentru Literatură, 1966), 265-266.
[19] Diculescu, *Bresle, negustori, și meseriași*, 99-128.

Hungarians were common among the city's artisans. There were even a few Russian coachmen.[20]

All the people of Bucharest were invited to take part in the Wallachian Revolution. The Islaz Proclamation called upon 'citizens, priests, boyars, soldiers, merchants, artisans, whatever your rank, your nation, your religion.' It invited 'Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians, Germans, Armenians, [and] Jews' to arm themselves to 'maintain good order' and to lend themselves to the 'grand work' of the revolution. 'The country is ours, it is yours,' it proclaimed, and the people of Bucharest took the message to heart.[21] While uncertainty reigned in the government's palace, the revolutionaries in the streets were forging a new popular political culture. It was based around print, public meetings, and clubs. But this outcome seemed far from certain when the news of revolution in Paris reached the city in March.

From Paris to Bucharest

Revolution in Europe gave fresh impetus to the liberal cause in Wallachia and threatened the legal and political order that Pavel Kiselev had introduced to the principality under the Organic Regulations. Upon hearing the news of events in Paris in February, the Russian consul Charles de Kotzebue was said to have remarked to Prince Gheorghe Bibescu that 'it's unlikely you and I will be eating our Easter eggs in Bucharest this year.'[22] Bibescu knew Paris well. Like many of the young revolutionaries he had studied in the French capital, although his own time in the city fell during the Bourbon Restoration rather than the July Monarchy. His political life in Wallachia began with the Organic Regulations, and he acceded to the throne in 1843 with the support of both conservative and liberal electors. One of his first acts as prince had been to pardon several men—including Nicolae Bălcescu—who had conspired against his predecessor, Alexandru II Ghica, and over the course of his reign

[20] Tappe, 'Bible Society', 390-391.
[21] CAD, 166PO/E/168 & TNA, FO 78/742, 163. 'Cetățeni în general, preoți, boeri, ostași, negustători, meseriași de ori-ce treaptă, de ori-ce nație, de ori-ce religie, ce vă aflați în Capitală și prin orașe, Greci, Sîrbi, Bulgari, Germani, Armeni, Israeliți, armați-vă spre a ține buna orânduiealã și a ajuta la fapta cea mare. Patria este a noastră și a voastră.'/'Citoyens eu général, Prêtres, Boïers, Soldats, Négociants, Artisans, quel que soit votre rang, votre nation, votre religion, vous qui habitez la Capitale et les villes, Grecs, Serviens, Bulgares, Allemands, Arméniens, Israëlites, armez vous pour maintenir le bon ordre ; prêtez votre aide à la grande oeurve. La Patrie est à nous, elle est à vous.'
[22] This story appeared in the *Mercure de Souabe* and the *Journal des Débats*, 16 April 1848. Reprod. in *Anul 1848,* I, 170. 'On dit que le Consul russe, M. de Kotzebue, aurait dit au Prince: „Il est probable que vous et moi nous ne mangerons pas à Bucharest nos œufs de Pâques."'

he promoted several measures to improve the principality's infrastructure and strengthen its ties with Europe and France in particular. But the February Revolution in Paris shifted the continent's political landscape, and his own moderate liberalism was superseded by a more radical form.

Rumours and news from across the continent electrified the city's atmosphere, and while conservatives worried, liberals grew bolder. Stories of the death of the Russian Tsar Nicholas I circulated in late March and produced a 'great agitation' in the city, and on Monday 27 March Ion Heliade Rădulescu's *Curierul Românesc* published news from Vienna: 'Metternich and all his ministers have fallen, and with them absolutism, to the great happiness of the people and the salvation of the ruling Austrian House.'[23] The Prince's own brother, Barbu Știrbei, fled the country in fear of an imminent tumult, and his Interior Minister, Alexandru Vilara, offered his resignation, which Bibescu refused.[24] Conservatives in the city were terrified by the prospect of both a revolution and the foreign occupation that would likely follow, but such thoughts were far from the minds of those who watched the unfolding of events in Western and Central Europe with anticipation and excitement.[25] Many members of the city's commercial classes had little interest in the revolutionary events, but others could talk of little else.[26] Young people addressed one another as 'citizen' when they passed in the street, and they openly celebrated the new era that had dawned in Europe.[27] The eighteen-year-old Petre Orbescu told the commission investigating revolutionary participants in February 1849 that he and his classmates at the Radu Voda Gymnasium had read all of the newspaper reports of European events during the spring, and they discussed the news from Paris and Vienna between classes.[28] Manifestoes appeared overnight on walls around Bucharest. They called for the 'abolition of boyar privileges, the establishment of a civic guard, and liberty of the press.'[29] Events across Europe had brought these ideas to the fore. Political debate was moving out of the halls of the palace and the assembly and into the open.

---

[23] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 28 March 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 23; *Curierul Românesc*, 15 March 1848. 'Metternih cu tot ministerial său căzu și cu acesta se resturnă absolutismul spre cea mai mare bucurie a Poporului și spre mântuința casei austriace domnitoare.'
[24] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 7 April 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 29.
[25] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 24 March 1848. TNA, FO 78/642, 25.
[26] The indifference of merchants was reported by the French consul Doré de Nion. See Doré de Nion to Monsieur le Chargé d'affaires de France à Constantinople, 29 March 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168.
[27] Charles de Kotzebue to Count Nesselrode, 7/19 March 1848, in Ion Varta, *Revoluția de la 1848 în Țările Române: documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* (Chișinau: Editura ARC, 1998), 3-6.
[28] ANIC, 601/25/1849, 3r.
[29] Florian Georgescu, 'Anul revoluționar 1848 în București', in Florian Georgescu et al. eds., *Istoria Orașului București*, (Bucharest: Muzeul de Istorie a Orașului București, 1965), 241-272, 244. 'Abolirea generală a privilegiilor boierimii, formarea unei gărzi civice și libertatea presei.'

Russian authorities pressured Bibescu to shut down these debates and isolate the principality from the political upheavals of Europe. There was no legislative threat to Prince Bibescu's authority. The elections of 1846 had given his supporters near-complete control of the Wallachian Assembly, and only the Prince himself could introduce legislation. But the rumblings in the streets had the authorities worried, and Russian representatives advised Bibescu to limit the principality's access to news from Europe. As early as 16 March—before news from Vienna had reached Saint Petersburg—the Chancellor Count Nesselrode wrote to Kotzebue instructing him that the rulers of both principalities should 'take measures to prevent the young men of Moldavia and Wallachia from visiting foreign universities' and exercise 'great circumspection' when issuing passports to visit other European states.[30] Wallachia and Moldavia needed to be isolated from the revolutionary currents of Europe. The Russian attitude to popular dissent and political change was unequivocal. 'Any popular movement,' reported the French consul Doré de Nion, 'any government measure that will modify the status quo, will be the signal for a corps of Russian troops to enter the principality.'[31] The Tsar could not and would not tolerate the spread of revolution into Eastern Europe.[32] His March Manifesto committed him to a policy of non-intervention in Western Europe, but he reserved the right to act if the threat of anarchy reached the borders of his empire. His declaration, wrote de Nion in April, left a 'painful impression' on the government and the citizens of Bucharest. It inspired 'discouragement approaching stupor.'[33]

Events in neighbouring Moldavia increased Russian pressure on the Wallachian capital. Some one thousand people had gathered for a meeting at the Saint Petersburg Hotel in Iași on 8 April. They formed a committee of sixteen, which drew up a thirty-five point programme to tackle corruption in Moldavia. It didn't call for the overthrow of the Organic Regulations, but rather their proper enforcement.[34] The document was circulated the following day and gathered around eight hundred signatures. It was delivered to Prince

---

[30] K. Nesselrode to K. Kotzebue, 16 March 1848, reprod in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 7-8. 'Nous croyons donc dans le moment actuel, devoir engager les deux Hospodars à prendre des mesures pour interdire aux jeunes gens Moldaves et Valaques la fréquentation des universités étrangères…Des passeports pour l'Europe ne devraient être délivrés aujourd'hui qu'avec une grande circonspection, et cela dans des cas exceptionnels seulement, pour quelque affaire urgente ou pour des intérêts commerciaux.'

[31] Doré de Nion to Monsieur le Chargé d'affaires de France à Constantinople, 29 March 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168. 'Tout mouvement populaire, toute mesure de l'autorité, tendant à modifier le statu quo, serait le signal de l'entrée d'un corps de troupes russes sur le territoire de la Principauté.'

[32] Ian W. Roberts, *Nicholas I and the Russian intervention in Hungary*, (London: Macmillan, 1991), 15-16.

[33] Doré de Nion to Monsieur le Chargé d'affaires de la République Française à Constantinople, 11 April 1848, CAD, 166PO/E/168. 'La connaissance de cette déclaration a produit ici, sur les chefs du gouvernement et sur la plus grande partie de la population, une impression douloureuse, un découragement qui approche de la stupeur.'

[34] For the text of this programme, see *Anul 1848,* I, 176-179.

Mihail Sturdza on 10 April, and he immediately ordered the arrest of some three hundred of the petitioners.[35] Many fled to neighbouring Bukovina. Others found sanctuary at the British vice-consulate in Brăila.[36] The Russian consul, Charles de Kotzebue, approved of Sturdza's response. He had good reason to hate the advocates of liberal reform. His father, the renowned German dramatist and writer August von Kotzebue, had been assassinated by a member of the German liberal-nationalist *Burschenschaften* movement in March 1819, when Charles was just thirteen years old. He travelled to Iași and found that the state of the city warranted the Prince's response. A messenger was sent to the general commandant of the Russian army in Bessarabia on 13 April with orders to position his troops on the frontier and await further instruction.[37] An invasion seemed imminent, and the mood in Bucharest was febrile. The historian A.T. Laurian told his friend George Bariț in Transylvania that the people of the city were 'peaceful, but afraid without knowing why,' and he himself was 'terrified that foreign powers will take this opportunity to trample us.'[38] Publication of Heliade Rădulescu's *Curierul Românesc* was suspended on 19 April, and efforts to prevent copies of the *Gazeta de Transilvania* from entering the principality intensified. Spies were rumoured to operate in every coffee house in the city to discover political dissent, and Interior Minister Vilara rejected all passport applications from those who wished to travel to Blaj in Transylvania, where large-scale political meetings of Transylvanian Romanians were scheduled to take place in May.[39] Kotzebue returned from Iași in time for Easter, and under his instruction the Department of Education dismissed several Transylvanian schoolteachers suspected of spreading subversive ideas.[40] General Alexander Duhamel joined Kotzebue in May, and he was confident of Russia's strong position in Europe, most especially in Moldavia and Wallachia. He boasted that Russia was 'powerful, more so perchance now than ever, from the fact of the weakness in which other powers found themselves' in the wake of revolutionary upheaval and 'was resolved to employ all the means in her Power to prevent

[35] For a brief account of events in Moldavia, see Maier, 'The Revolution of 1848 in Moldavia and Wallachia', 193-196.
[36] For their names and details of their attempts to flee into Austrian territory, see Lloyd to Colquhoun, 19 April 1848 & a letter from the Moldavian boyars to Colquhoun of the same date. TNA, FO 78/742, 51-53 & 55-56.
[37] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 28 April 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 48v-49r.
[38] A.T. Laurian to George Bariț, 08/20 April 1848, reprod. in Pascu, Ștefan & Iosif Pervain eds., *George Bariț și contemporanii săi*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1973-), 8 vols, vol I, 145-146. 'Aici, toate în liniște, însă și în temere, fără să știi pentru ce…Mă tem tare să nu a străinii prilej de a ne călca.'
[39] Vasile Maciu, 'Ion Heliade Rădulescu in the Romanian Revolution of 1848', *Southeastern Europe* 6 (1979), 46-58, 49; Stan, *Revoluția română*, 101; Bodea, *Romanians' Struggle for unification*, 169.
[40] Kotzebue to Nesselrode, 20 May/1 June 1848, in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 101-102.

any measure being adopted, which would be subversive to the established order in the Provinces.'[41]

But support for reform was widespread in Bucharest, and it crossed the political divide. Several meetings took place in April to discuss reform programmes and the redress of popular grievances. These meetings brought together conservative great boyars and liberals of more minor social standing. Among their attendees was Dimitrie Ghica, the son of the former Prince Grigore IV Ghica. He left Bucharest before the revolution to escape the cholera outbreak of June, and he addressed the editor of the revolutionary gazette *Popolul Suveran* from Transylvania during the summer. 'I thought,' he wrote, 'like the better part of you, that after the immense commotion of February we needed to enact reforms at home and deal with abuses.' He suggested that these were the only means of preventing a 'tumultuous popular movement' that would bring 'incalculable calamities' to the principality and stunt its progress.[42] Even Charles de Kotzebue was willing to support the redress of governmental abuses. He met with several members of the liberal party—including Constantin A. Rosetti and Ion Ghica—in early April to hear their complaints. He warned them that at the first sign of revolution he would summon a Russian army, but if they refrained from violence, then he promised to 'use his endeavours to get the abuses of which they complained redressed by the Prince.'[43] The liberals pushed for more dramatic change. The revolutionary events in Europe had created a climate conducive to reform, and they sought to exploit it. Rosetti held several meetings with Bibescu. He urged him to offer 'immediate and large concessions to publick [sic] opinion,' including a free press, the appointment of new and responsible ministers, a shift in the burden of taxation towards the boyar and mercantile classes, and the dismissal of the Assembly and extension of the franchise to all property owners. His demands were common to many of the revolutionary programmes of spring, and the request for responsible ministers echoed the *Curierul Românesc* article that followed Metternich's fall in March. Bibescu demurred. He told Rosetti that 'the moment was not favourable, nor was Wallachia in a condition to receive such Institutions.' Bibescu may have had liberal sympathies, but he was closely aligned with Russia, and there was an authoritarian streak to his character. He had prorogued the Wallachian Assembly in March 1844 and ruled by decree until the elections of

[41] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 25 May 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 62.
[42] BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXVIII/4c, 1r. '…j'ai cru, comme la plupart d'autre vous, qu'à la suite de l'immense commotion de février, il y avait chez nous des reformes à opérer, des abus a réduction, et j'ai même pensé que c'était là peut-être l'unique moyen de prévenir des mouvements populaires tumultueux qui, en attirant sur le pays d'incalculables calamités, nous feraient rétrograder au lieu de nous pousser vers le progrès.'
[43] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 6 April 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 35v-36r.

November 1846 returned an assembly that was more to his liking. Rosetti took his claim to be the 'firm and true friend' of the liberals as 'so much empty air.'[44]

The Ottomans were more sympathetic to the cause of reform, but Russian influence on Bibescu was stronger. Talaat Effendi was sent from Constantinople to Bucharest to act as the suzerain power's representative in the principality. He arrived in early June and was surprised when he met with members of the liberal party. They bore little resemblance to the men described in Bibescu's reports, and their ideas struck him as being within the bounds of acceptable change. He received their memorandum on 17 June, less than a week before the meeting at Islaz. It expressed loyalty to the Porte and emphasised the role of the principalities within the Ottoman sphere. Moldavia and Wallachia were not only the Ottoman gateway to Europe, but also the 'most natural barrier against the rapid encroachment of Panslavism.'[45] Bibescu had claimed that the liberals wished to 'throw off their allegiance to the Porte, and unite with their neighbors in Transylvania,' but the programme they presented to Talaat was concerned with internal reforms rather than the principality's geopolitical status. He was reassured, and mindful of the possibility of revolution and the damage that a subsequent Russian invasion would do to Ottoman interests, he urged Bibescu to listen to their demands and stop arresting his political opponents.[46] Talaat left Bucharest on 19 June to travel to Iași, and his counsel went unheeded. General Duhamel enjoyed greater influence over the Prince. The new French consul, Hory, reported to General Aupick that the Russian was 'greatly displeased' by the meeting between Talaat and the liberal party. He urged Bibescu to 'substitute harshness for leniency.'[47]

Duhamel's influence provoked resentment among the increasingly vocal liberals of the city. The prominent journalist Ion Heliade Rădulescu had penned a satirical song titled 'The Song of the Bear' to mark his arrival in the Wallachian capital. He taught a bear trainer to sing it and sent him to perform outside Duhamel's residence and hand out copies of the song in both French and Romanian. The bear was a common stand-in for Russia, and if Duhamel was under any illusions that the song was an attack on his person, it was made clear by a reference to the way that he held a cigar in his mouth during a meeting with the boyars. The

[44] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 6 April 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 31v-33r.
[45] A copy of the liberal memorandum can be found at TNA, FO 78/742, 83-89, 88v. 'le boulevard de l'Empire Ottoman, et sa barrière la plus naturelle contre les empiètements rapides du Panslavisme.'
[46] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 20 June 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 78-82.
[47] Hory to Aupick, 22 June 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168. 'L'Hospodar qui d'abord avait renoncé à faire usage des mesures coërcitives mises à sa disposition par le firman qui a précédé ici l'arrivée de Tala'at Efendi, a tout à coup changé de résolution. On attribue ce changement subit à l'instigation du général Duhamel, qui, fort mécontent d'une démarche faite par les jeunes Valaques auprès du Commissaire Turc, dans le but de protester de leur dévouement à la Porte, aurait engagé le Prince à substituer la rigueur à la clémence.'

final line of each verse echoed his name: 'Diha! Diha-mei!'[48] It wasn't the only song to target Duhamel personally. Another, titled 'The Song of Duhamel,' was also sung in the city. It was adapted from a common folk song or *doină,* and Duhamel's name echoed between every line: 'Duha-mele-mu.'[49] Such brazen attacks on the Russian general's character indicated the extent to which the government was losing control of the city.

The liberals were laying plans for revolution, and they worked to establish a broad base of popular support. Ion Heliade Rădulescu and his cousin, Mărgărit Moșoiu, engaged the heads of several of Bucharest's corporations to spread propaganda among the merchants and artisans, and the painter Ion Negulici and the Hegumen of Snagov Monastery, Iosef Snagoveanu, were charged with winning the support of the city's clergy, young people, and 'honest landowners.'[50] A committee was formed on 22 May to steer events. It met at the house of one of the Golescu brothers, and its members included Ștefan, Nicolae, Radu, and the two Alexandrus Golescu—'the white' and 'the black'—as well as Ion and Dumitru Brătianu, Constantin and Nicolae Bălcescu, C.A. Rosetti, Cezar Bolliac, and Heliade Rădulescu himself.[51] One of the committee's first objectives was to gather money to buy weapons, and the names of some of the donors offer a glimpse of the changing political dynamics of the spring and summer of 1848. Three names stand out: C. Cantacuzino, Al. Ghica, and I. Solomon.[52] Solomon was the head of the Bucharest garrison. He initially supported the revolution, but then joined with the Minister of War, Ion Odobescu, in an attempt to overthrow the Provisional Government on 1 July. Ghica was Bibescu's predecessor, the man whom Nicolae Bălcescu and others had plotted to bring down, and Cantacuzino would become the interim governor, or Caimacam, of the principality after the Ottomans invaded on 25 September. All three men were described as members of the 'retrograde or antinational party' by Heliade Rădulescu in his *Mémoires* of the revolution, but all three had supported the revolutionary cause during spring. The committee put their money to good use.[53] It organised the workers of Bucharest into cells and hid cockades,

---

[48] See Ion Heliade Rădulescu, *Satirele și Fabulele,* (Craiova: Typo-Litographia Națională Ralian Samitca, 1883), 132-136.
[49] See BAR, Mss Rom 5029, 3.
[50] J. Héliade Radulesco, *Mémoires sur l'histoire de la régénération roumaine ou sur les événements de 1848 accomplis en Valache*, (Paris: Librairie de la propagande démocratique et sociale européene, 1851), 38. 'Par un autre de ses cousins, Margarit Mossoiu, il initia au secret plusieurs chefs de corporations qui se chargèrent de faire la même propagande au nom de l'ordre, parmi les commerçants et les artisans. Héliade s'entendit ensuite avec l'abbé de Znagov, Josaphat, avec le professeur Negulici et plusieurs autres, autour desquels pouvaient se réunir le clergé, la jeunesse, et les honnêtes gens propriétaires et pères de famille.'
[51] Radulesco, *Mémoires,* 54-56.
[52] Iordache, *Goleștii,* 78.
[53] Radulesco, *Mémoires,* 20-21.

banners, and arms in the city's monasteries with the support of the clergy, ready to be brought out when the revolution demanded.[54] The thirty-two-year-old Costache Halepliu told the commission investigating the revolution in March 1849 that he had overheard several plotters during the night of 6 June while walking in one of the public gardens, though he gave few details of what he had heard. He said that he reported it to the police at the time, but they took little notice.[55]

Revolutionary propaganda became increasingly assertive and public in June. The conversation that Halepliu overheard coincided with the appearance of a series of pamphlets in Bucharest. The most famous was titled *Ce Sînt Meseriașii?* or 'What are the Artisans?' It took its cues from the Abbé Sièyes' *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?* of 1789 and injected an element of Saint-Simonian thought. The Wallachians weren't the first to adopt Sièyes' formula. The Königsberg radical Johann Jacoby had done the same in an 1841 pamphlet titled *Vier Fragen beantwortet von einem Ostpressen*.[56] Jacoby—like Sièyes—had argued that the people were entitled to a constitution, and the author of the anonymous Wallachian pamphlet took the same line. It asked 'what are the artisans?' and answered 'Everything.' Until that day, they had been 'nothing', but now they wished to be 'something.'[57] The pamphlet defined the artisans in the same terms as Sièyes did the Third Estate.[58] They were not only the shoemakers, bakers, carpenters, tanners, and tailors. They were also the ploughmen, writers, professors, doctors, engineers, and artists. 'Every man in society is an artisan,' the pamphlet said, 'with the exception of those lazy people who sit about and do no work, who eat, drink, and sleep, who are born and die without leaving anything behind.'[59] It wasn't hard to see the principality's leading landowners in that category of 'lazy people'. These were the 'idlers' of Saint-Simonian thought. It was the artisans—in the shape of the ploughmen—who had invested the land with value, as Nicolae Bălcescu had demonstrated in his pre-revolutionary essay.[60] The same logic could be found in this anonymous pamphlet, which was a clear appeal to the productive classes of Bucharest society. The twenty-three proposed measures included in the

---

[54] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 21 June 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 90v.
[55] For Halepliu's full account of the conspiracy, see ANIC, 601/41/1849, 2-3. A French translation appears in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 391-393.
[56] See Robert M. Berdahl, *The Politics of the Prussian Nobility: The Development of a Conservative Ideology, 1770-1848*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 320-321.
[57] 'Ce Sînt Meseriași', reprod. in *Anul 1848,* I, 460-467, 460. 'Gândul acestei scrieri este lesne de înțeles. Avem trei întrebări a deslega. 1. Ce sînt meseriașii? Tot. 2. Ce au fost ei până acum? Nimic. 3. Ce cer ei astăzi? A fi ceva.
[58] For Sièyes' pamphlet, see Emmanuel Joseph Sièyes, *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers-État?,* (Paris, 1789).
[59] *Anul 1848,* I, 461. 'tot omul într'o soțietate este meseriaș, afară numai de leneșul acela care șeade pe saltea fără de a lucra nimic, care mănîncă, bea i doarme, care se nasce și moare fără de a lăsa nici o urmă de vieața lui.'
[60] See chapter one.

pamphlet were not the same as the twenty-three articles of the Islaz Proclamation. There was no mention of the emancipation of the Roma or Jews, and the leading proposals included the abolition of ranks and titles, the extension of the franchise, and the establishment of a national bank. The pamphlet was designed to cause a stir, and it succeeded.

Rumour and cholera exacerbated the city's unrest. The second global cholera pandemic reached Wallachia and neighbouring Moldavia in April. It began in the ports of Brăila and Galați, which saw a combined eighty-three deaths between 20 April and 15 May, and attempts to contain the spread of the disease failed. It hit Bucharest in June, and by the middle of the month between eighty and one hundred new cases were reported every day.[61] The first cases were confined to the lower classes of society, but it didn't take long for the disease to spread to the wealthier districts.[62] The city's tribunals were closed from 12 June onwards, and many boyars fled for the Transylvanian frontier. Prince Bibescu was among them, but he quickly returned, and a rumour circulated that he had done so on General Duhamel's orders.[63] His presence did little to quell the unease, and stories of unrest in the surrounding countryside scared many of those who remained in the city. There were even rumours that the peasants were gathering to enter Bucharest *en masse* to demand political concessions and seize the city's grain by force. The Galician Uprising of 1846, which saw many Polish nobles slaughtered by peasants, was fresh in the memory.[64] Faced with the threat of violence and disease, many in the Wallachian capital must have feared for their lives.

An attempt on Prince Bibescu's life threatened to undermine the revolution before it had even begun. The first shots were fired on 21 June, but they were not taken under the direction of the revolutionary committee. Some time between eight and nine o'clock in the evening, Prince Bibescu took his carriage out for a drive. Another carriage pulled up alongside his, and in perhaps the first recorded attempt at a drive-by shooting in history, three young boyars named Alecsandru Paleologu, Dumitru Crețulescu, and Grigore Pereț discharged their pistols and rode off into the night. Bibescu was unharmed. The only damage to his person was a torn epaulette, and he immediately ordered the arrest of the conspirators,

[61] See Hory to Aupick, 8 June 1848. CAD 166PO/E/168 and Colquhoun to Palmerston, 15 May 1848. TNA, FO 78/744, 190-192.
[62] Hory to Aupick, 17 June 1848. CAD 166PO/E/168.
[63] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 17 June 1848. TNA, FO 78/744, 195-196.
[64] See Ilie Corfus, *Agricultura Țării Românești în prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea,* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1969), 239-244. On the Galician Uprising, see Judson, *The Habsburg Empire,* 157-162 and Larry Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia: History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture,* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 111-188.

who fled the city post-haste.[65] It seemed the initiative had been lost. Colquhoun reported that there was only one feeling in Bucharest regarding the young men's attempt: 'indignation…and none are more loud in uttering these sentiments than many of those who are known to have formed part of the attempt to revolutionize the country.'[66] Florian Aaron lamented the three would-be assassins' stupidity in a letter to his friend George Barițiu the next day.

> You know that a plot, conspiracy, insurrection, revolution—I really don't know what good name to give it—was supposed to break out here. I didn't like it from the beginning. It had no head, only tails. This morning, at 3 o'clock, the signal was to be given to meet somewhere and put everything into action, although nobody knew where or to what end. The whole thing was dreamed up without a proper plan, and it ended in farce. This insurrection was the product of the young people who don't know how to guard secrets. Even the old women found out about it. The police knew what they were planning for ages, but either because they didn't want to or couldn't, they didn't try to put it down before it started. Then last night several young people shot at the Prince while he was out in his carriage. The police… caught the criminals and laid their hands on the leaders of the plot… Their energetic work paralysed the conspiracy, the signal wasn't given, and the poor youths who were waiting for it fell into custody.[67]

But were it not for this botched assassination, the course of the Wallachian Revolution might not have been so revolutionary. In a letter written in the afterglow of the events of 23 June, when a 'new epoch began in the annals of Wallachia' and 'the slogan of civilised peoples: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' became 'the motto of the Wallachians', and with the bells of the city still ringing in his ear, Aaron described how the police had worked tirelessly through the night of 21 June and the following day to apprehend the plotters. But 'the thread of this patriotic movement,' he wrote, was 'more sinuous than they could discover,' and exhausted by their endeavours, the police were powerless to prevent the movement of 23 June.[68] Aaron wrote his letter on 24 June. Bibescu resigned the following day.[69] The

---

[65] For Colquhoun's account of the assassination attempt, see TNA, FO 78/742, 95-97; for Hory's account see Hory to Aupick, 22 June 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168; for attempts to locate Paleologu, Crețulescu, and Pereț see *Anul 1848,* I, 504-505.

[66] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 22 June 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 96v.

[67] Florian Aaron to George Barițiu 10/22 June 1848, reprod. in Pascu, *George Barițiu,* I, 65-66. 'Știi că la noi era să izbucnească un complot, conspirație, insurecție, revoluție, nu știu cum să o numesc pe nume bun. Nu mi-a plăcut de la început, pentru că n-avea cap, decît coade multe. Astăzi dimineață, la 3 ore dimineața, era să se dea semnalul spre a se aduna la un loc și a porni unde și pentru ce, nu știu nimini. Tot lucrul era închipuit fără plan și pentru aceea s-a isprăvit ca o farsă.'

[68] Aaron to Barițiu, 12/24 June 1848, reproduced in Pascu, *George Barițiu,* I, 66-69. 'Zioa de ieri, 11 iunie 1848, este o zi de la care începe o epohă nouă în analele Țării Românești. Deviza populilor civilizați: Libertate, Egalitate,

revolutionary leaders had wanted to keep him in place to provide a 'legal framework' for change, but Bibescu would not lend them his authority.[70] His decision was motivated by three factors: the ongoing threat of cholera, the attempt on his life, and the likelihood of an imminent Russian invasion, of which both Kotzebue and Duhamel had warned him repeatedly. He preferred not to ally himself with the revolutionaries against that threat. His belongings were loaded into his carriage, and he fled Bucharest for the relative safety of Transylvania. The full reins of the state fell into revolutionary hands.

Revolution in the Palace

The Wallachian Revolution of June 1848 inaugurated an experiment in government. The French historian Maurice Agulhon has argued that the years 1848 to 1852 in France constituted a 'republican experiment' or 'apprenticeship.'[71] They offered the people new opportunities for practical political participation. The same was true of Wallachia, but the revolution also gave many men their first experience of government office.[72] The Ministry of 23 June was formed with Bibescu's consent. His support gave the new government legitimacy both within Wallachia and beyond its borders, but his resignation created a power vacuum in Bucharest that the revolutionary leaders struggled to fill. A new Provisional Government took office on 26 June with the head of the Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Neofit, named as President. Dan Berindei discounted Neofit as a 'constant counterrevolutionary,' but his appointment served a clear purpose.[73] He was chosen to embed the revolutionary government in the existing structures of power and overcome the obstacles raised by Bibescu's departure.

Internal division, inexperience, and a severe financial deficit threatened the new government's programme. Several members of the French Provisional Government had enjoyed long political careers under the July Monarchy, but the same was not true of their

---

Frățietate este și deviza românilor de aici… Dar urzeala aceștii mișcări patriotice era mai încurcată decît să se poată descoperi.'

[69] For Bibescu's abdication letter, see *Anul 1848,* I, 556.

[70] Apostol Stan, 'Revolution and legality in the Romanian Principalities in 1848', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXVII (1998), 105-111, 107. See also, Apostol Stan, 'Revoluție și legalitate în 1848 în principatele române', *Revista Istorică*, IX (1998), 373-380.

[71] Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment;* Maurice Agulhon, *1848 ou l'apprentissage de la République, 1848-1852,* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1973).

[72] On popular participation in the Wallachian Revolution, see the section on 'Revolution in the Streets' below for Bucharest, and chapter 3 for the rest of the country.

[73] Berindei, *Revoluția Română,* 275.

Wallachian counterparts. They were generally younger, and few had any government experience.[74] Ion Heliade Rădulescu and Nicolae Bălcescu were better known for their cultural and journalistic activities. Bălcescu had also served in the military—as had several other members of the new administration—but he had never held political office. Only the Interior Minister, Nicolae Golescu, was familiar with his brief. He had headed the Department of Internal Affairs under Bibescu until 1847. C.A. Rosetti doubted the ability of his and his colleagues to govern. He described them in a letter to Ion Ghica in mid-August as men who 'could destroy, but who could not build,' and he included himself in that judgement. 'I am not so stupid,' he wrote, 'as to think I have the capacity to govern…if the government were composed of other men, then the country might survive.'[75] His doubts were not new. They had been there since the beginning. He and Ion Brătianu had both resigned their posts as secretaries on 29 June. Rosetti's resignation letter stated that he could be 'more useful to the country in this great undertaking if I don't occupy a post.'[76] Other members of the government questioned his and Brătianu's commitment to the revolution. A brief note in the official gazette, *Popolul Suveran,* announced their departure. The principality was in a 'most critical moment,' and it needed agents whose 'devotion to the people is certain.' The two men's decision undermined the unity of the revolution, and 'divisions,' the announcement read, 'have always been fatal for any cause.'[77] Both Rosetti and Brătianu would return to government service, but their indecisiveness demonstrated the extent to which the Provisional Government was cobbled together, and its cause was not helped by the parlous state of public finances. Robert Colquhoun reported on 7 July that there were 'fearful deficits in most of the Publick [sic] chests. In one 80,000 Ducats, in another 130,000.' Bibescu had taken his salary several months in advance, and he and his allies had absconded with much of the government's money. 'There is little doubt,' wrote Colquhoun, 'that if the present Government remains in power a short time longer, that several transactions of a nature which

---

[74] For an analysis of the ages and social backgrounds of the revolutionaries, see Berindei, *Revoluția Română,* 265-275.

[75] *Anul 1848*, III, 70. 'Oamenii ce alcătuiau Guvernul aveau capacitate de détruire, mais non pas celle de construire…nici odată nu am fost atât de prost, în cât să nu cunosc că nu am capacitate de a guverna…dacă acest Guvern se compunea de alți oameni, țeara era scăpată.'

[76] *Anul 1848,* I, 635. 'Am convicția că neocupând nici un post pociu fi mai folositor patriei în aceste grele împrejurări…'

[77] *Anul 1848,* I, 635. '…Acum, când patria se află în cele mai critice momente, când avem trebuința cea mai mare ca in Guvern să se afle personae despre al cărora devotement popolul este sigur, tragerea dumné-lor nu se poate socoti decât ca o desghinare din aleșii țării și desghinările au fost tot-deauna fatale pentru or-ce causă. Când Guvernul proclamă și cere de la popol unirea, pentru ce nu ne dă el însuși exemplul? Au nu avem cu toții aceleași interese? Au no dorim toți binele public? Nu voim a ne lăsa într'asemenea cugetări sinister și ne place a crede că nuvela despre demisia cetățenilor Rosetti și Brătianu nupoate fi adeverată…'

can be hardly termed legitimate will come to light.'[78] Several articles of the revolutionary programme—including those granting the peasants land and Roma slaves their freedom—mandated financial compensation, and Bibescu's regime had deprived the Provisional Government of its ability to pay it.[79]

Government instability provided the revolution's opponents with their first opportunity to attempt a counterrevolution. It happened on 1 July, less than a week after the Provisional Government had taken office. Some two hundred landowners gathered at the Hotel Momolo on Podul Mogoșoaiei to discuss article thirteen of the Islaz Proclamation, which promised land to the peasantry. They met in the same hall where Franz Liszt had given a series of concerts over Christmas 1846, and they voted unanimously to oppose the government's plans.[80] The new Minister of War, Ion Odobescu, was present, and so was the head of the Bucharest garrison, Lieutenant Solomon. They gathered a troop of soldiers and marched to the Provisional Government's headquarters in the former palace of Prince Gheorghe Bibescu. Solomon and the soldiers stood guard while Odobescu and a handful of men entered the palace. They were met at the top of the staircase by one of the members of the Provisional Government, Christian Tell, and Odobescu ordered his soldiers to lay hands upon him. The alarm was raised. The people of Bucharest flocked to the palace, the counterrevolution was defeated, and Odobesu, Solomon, and Colonel Grigore Lăcusteanu were arrested and put on trial. Solomon defended himself by pointing to the resignations of Rosetti and Brătianu. Neither he nor Odobescu had wanted to bring down the Provisional Government. They were trying to save it from falling apart and providing a pretext for a Russian invasion.[81] The military tribunal rejected their defence, and the three men were imprisoned. Odobescu and Solomon would later be banished to prevent them from becoming a rallying point for counterrevolution.

The greatest threat to the new government's survival was the possibility of a Russian invasion. In a letter to General Aupick of 27 June, the French consul reported that his Russian counterpart had told him that the 'assassination attempt on Prince Bibescu, the rising of peasants in the districts, and the defection of a part of the army would appear to the

[78] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 7 July 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 143r.
[79] See chapter three for the land question and the abolition of Roma slavery and chapter four for attempts to find financial support abroad. The revolution also created difficulties in marketplaces and financial speculation was common in June and July in particular. See Constantin Moisil, 'Problema monetară în Țara Românească în anii 1848-1849', *Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române* 19 (1924), 27-37 & 59-95.
[80] I. Weinberg, 'Franz Liszt și Iohann Strauss în București anilor 1847-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, IV (1966), 369-378.
[81] For Odobescu's interrogation, see *Anul 1848,* II, 109-121; For Solomon's, see *Anul 1848,* II, 122-128.

Emperor as sufficient motive for an immediate occupation.'[82] A response was needed. The Provisional Government had to assert its control over the principality, and Metropolitan Neofit addressed Tsar Nicholas I directly. He told him that the Provisional Government was 'working tirelessly to maintain order…and to implement the new reforms,' which would place the principality's internal affairs on a 'broader and better balanced base.'[83] But Neofit's commitment to the revolutionary project was uncertain, and his ambivalence was expressed in two letters to Kotzebue written on 5 July. His first argued that the Wallachian people could not abandon the cause of reform and expressed his personal satisfaction with the course of events. [84] The second asked 'what can the feeble voice of a priest do amidst this outburst of popular passions?'[85] The Russians favoured the introduction of a regency, or caimacamie—a word of Turkish origin that denoted an interim governor—to restore order, and Neofit told Kotzebue that such an outcome could only be realised if the revolutionary leaders left Bucharest. The people had shown their willingness to defend the government once. A second coup would yield the same outcome. He advised Kotzebue that if the government did leave Bucharest, then he would 'form a caimacamie with several boyars who remain in the city in accordance with the instructions you have given me.'[86] The opportunity arrived within a week. It was provoked by rumours of an imminent Russian invasion. Nicolae Bălcescu had returned from Focșani with word that both the Russian and the Turkish armies were approaching Wallachia's borders, and a courier from Iași seemed to confirm the story. The French consul, Hory, feared the news would cause 'great disorder in the country.' He told General Aupick that 'we cannot rely on the military or the national guard to maintain tranquillity and respect for persons and property.'[87] The rumours intensified over the next

[82] Hory to Aupick, 27 June 1848. CAD 166PO/E/168. 'Cette intervention armée est peut être plus proche qu'on ne le croit…Monsieur Kotzebue m'a dit, une heure avant le départ du Commissaire Russe « qu'il ne connaissait pas précisément les intentions de l'Empereur au sujet de l'intervention armée, mais qu'il avait la presque certitude que la tentative d'assassinat dirigée contre le Prince Bibesco, le soulèvement des paysans de différens districts, la défection d'une partie de la malice, paraitront à l'Empereur de nature à motiver suffisamment l'occupation immédiate de la Valachie.'

[83] Neofit to Nicolae I, June/July 1848. reprod. in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 140-141. '…il travaille sans relâche à maintenir le bon ordre qui ne laisse rien à désirer, et à mettre à exécution la nouvelle réforme qui n'ayant trait qu'à la régularisation des affaires de l'intérieur sur des bases plus larges et mieux pondérées…'

[84] Neofit to Kotzebue, 5 July 1848. reprod. in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 141-143.

[85] Neofit to Kotzebue, 5 July 1848. reprod. in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 144. 'Que peut faire la faible voix d'un prêtre au milieu du déchainement des passions populaires ?'

[86] Neofit to Kotzebue, 5 July 1848. Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 144. '…l'institution de la Caïmacamie ne sont possibles que le jour où les individus, qui oppriment le pays, quitteront la Capitale, et ils ne la quitteront, soyez en bien convaincu, qu'à l'approche des troupes Impériales ; si à cette époque je me trouve encore en vie je formerai avec les quelques Boyards, qui sont restés, la Caimacamie pour me conformer aux instructions que Vous avez bien voulu me marquer…'

[87] Hory to Aupick. 8 July 1848. CAD 166PO/E/168. 'Il est à craindre surtout que cette nouvelle ne cause de graves désordres dans le Pays, dès qu'elle aura transpiré dans le public, et malheureusement on ne peut trop

few days, and the Provisional Government fled the city. Neofit convened a meeting of the leading boyars and established a caimacamie under Teodor Văcărescu and Emanuil Băleanu. Odobescu and Solomon were released, the national guard was dissolved, and a new aga of police was appointed. But the people resisted, and the Provisional Government returned once it became clear that the rumours were baseless and Russian soldiers had not set foot on Wallachian soil. The Caimacamie was deposed, and Neofit 'solemnly renewed the Oath of Allegiance to the Constitution.'[88]

The Provisional Government tried to project an image of unity and stability on the world stage, but it struggled to win the support of boyars and military officers. Foreign Minister Ion Voinescu II was sensitive to the geopolitical implications of counterrevolution. He circulated a letter to the foreign consuls in Bucharest in the wake of Odobescu and Solomon's failed coup to 'counter the sinister interpretations that the wrongdoers will surely spread through the capital.' He suggested the coup was the work of 'ambitious, egotistical, and greedy landowners' who were working against the Provisional Government, which had only acted to 'maintain public peace and meet the most pressing needs' of the people.[89] The Provisional Government went further in its public denunciation. It described the coup as an attack on 'liberty, on justice, and on brotherhood…[an attempt] to compromise our cause in the eyes of Europe.'[90] The same themes appeared in the government's appeals to the boyars. Many had fled Bucharest during the cholera epidemic in June. They retired to their country estates or crossed the border into Transylvania, and more followed in the wake of the revolutionary upheaval.[91] The Provisional Government made repeated attempts to lure them back to the capital. A draft proclamation of 24 July threatened that if they did not return then they would 'attract criminal suspicion and be arrested immediately,' but it's unclear how

compter sur la milice ni sur la garde nationale pour maintenir la tranquillité et faire respecter les personnes et les propriétés.'

[88] R.G. Colquhoun to Lord Palmerston, 13 July 1848. TNA FO78/742, 174v.

[89] Ion Voinescu II to R.G. Colquhoun, 2 July 1848. TNA FO 78/742, 133r. 'Pour prévenir les interprétations sinistres que des malveillants ne manqueront pas de répandre dans la Capitale sur les évènemens [sic] d'hier…je m'empresse de vous annoncer que des ambitieux, des propriétaires égoïstes et avides ayant tenté de dénigrer le Gouvernement Provisoire, dont les efforts ne tendaient qu'à maintenir la tranquillité publique et à faire face aux besoins les plus pressants en tâchant de concilier tous les intérêts de l'état…'

[90] BAR, Doc Ist, DCCCX/144. Also published in *Pruncul Român* and reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 31. 'O trădare infernală se urzise în protiva libertății, în protiva dreptății și a frăției…era pus de vrăjmașii țării să facă o răscoală și să compromită causa noastră în ochii Europei…'

[91] See, for instance, Cleopatra Trubetzkoi's letter to her cousin, Dimitrie Ghica, sent from her estate in Buzău, where one Mme Baranescu and her family also took shelter, ready at any moment to travel onwards to Transylvania. BNR, Fond Bratianu, XXXVI/3, 34-35.

widely this address was circulated.[92] A second proclamation appeared a day later that was more conciliatory, and a third was issued on 31 July. It announced that the cholera epidemic was over and that Wallachia 'now more than ever needed its sons.' They were urged to return to Bucharest 'so that we can show to all Europe, which has its eyes upon us, that in all of Wallachia there isn't a single person who didn't participate actively in the resurrection of the Wallachian nation.'[93] A fourth decree was circulated four days later, and the list of names to whom it was addressed indicates how many of the leading boyars preferred to remain outside the city. Among them were two of the men who had contributed to the revolutionary committee's fund: the former Prince Alexandru Ghica and the future Caimacam Constantin Cantacuzino.[94] The absence of these prominent boyars likely helped the revolutionary government to settle in Bucharest, but it also undermined its position on the European stage. It claimed to speak for all the Wallachian people, but many prominent boyars remained aloof, and there were doubts about the revolution in the army, too. Nicolae Bălcescu told Ion Ghica on 28 July that the army was 'demoralised and had lost all its discipline.'[95] There was no repeat of Odobescu's failed putsch—although there was a brief revolt within the Bucharest garrison in mid-September following a cut to military meat rations---but desertions and resignations were common.[96] The new head of the Wallachian army, Christian Tell, reported on 11 August that one Atanasie Călinescu, a sub-lieutenant in the cavalry, had been absent from his post since Bibescu's abdication.[97] Many more officers resigned their commissions. Some—like one Captain I. Bălănescu—cited illness, and others—such as a Lieutenant Cotopulea—claimed that their 'domestic interests' were no longer compatible with military service.[98] It is difficult to gauge whether these claims were true. If investigations took place, then the paperwork no longer survives. Tell never lacked for men to replace those who quit

[92] A French translation accompanies Hory to Aupick, 30 July 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168. '…dans le cas contraire, en prolongeant leur séjour au dehors, ils s'attireraient un soupçon criminel et seraient arrêter immédiatement.'
[93] BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 10r. Also reproduced in *Anul 1848,* II, 603-604. 'Văzând că boala holerii a încetat cu totul; Considerând iarăși că țara acum mai mult de cît tot dauna are trebuință de fii ei, în numele României și a fericirei ei, invităm pe toți rumâni ce să află peste graniță și pe la moșiile dumneaor, să intre cât mai în grab în capitală, casă putem arăta europi întregi, care are ochii pe noi, că în toată rumâniei na rămas un singur om carele nu a luat parte activă la această înviere a Neamului rumânesc.'
[94] A copy addressed to Michail Cornescu can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 251; for the full list of names see the version reprod. in *Anul 1848*, II, 693-694.
[95] Bălcescu, *Opere* IV, 97. 'Armata noastră s-a demoralizat și a perdut de tot disciplina.'
[96] On the revolt over meat rations, see Colquhoun to Palmerston, 14 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 43r; See also Hory to Aupick, 15 September 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168.
[97] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 55. Other examples can also be found at ANIC 601/1/1848, vol. VI, 773-790.
[98] See BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 104 (Bălănescu) and 105 (Cotopulea). 'Acum caznicile mele enteresuri nu mai ertândumă a mai urma slujba ostășească.'

the service, but the level of turnover in the higher ranks of the military suggests that support flagged during the summer.[99]

Ottoman support was needed to give the revolution a sense of political stability. It came with the visit of Suleiman Pasha, but there was a cost: the fall of the Provisional Government and its replacement with a Princely Lieutenancy. Suleiman arrived at Giurgiu on the Danube on 31 July. He was met there by a government delegation led by the Foreign Minister, Ion Voinescu II, but Suleiman refused to receive him in an official capacity as the Provisional Government had not been recognised by the Porte. Instead he met with boyars and revolutionaries in their capacity as 'notables' of the country.[100] He castigated the revolutionaries. They had replaced the principality's legitimate government with a 'new and illegal administration,' which was 'not only incompatible with the right of suzerainty and the principles of the Sublime Porte,' but which also intended to introduce changes 'contrary to the maintenance of order and tranquillity in the country.'[101] The Ottoman position was clear: more moderate government was required. Suleiman favoured the appointment of a single 'Lieutenant,' but the people of Bucharest who gathered on Liberty Field chose six: Neofit, Heliade Rădulescu, Ștefan Golescu, Christian Tell, Gheorghe Magheru, and Nicolae Mincu. Suleiman rejected their choice. He told the Wallachian representatives at Giurgiu that the six names had to be reduced to three within twenty-four hours or he would 'march on the capital and dictate his own terms.' [102] His order was obeyed, and the people chose Heliade Rădulescu, Tell, and Nicolae Golescu to form a new Princely Lieutenancy.

The fall of the Provisional Government and the establishment of the Princely Lieutenancy represented the triumph of moderate over radical revolution. The young radicals were dismayed by the change in government, but the most vociferous opposition came from Gheorghe Magheru in Oltenia. He learned of the changes from an article in *Pruncul Român,* and they were confirmed by a letter from Christian Tell. Four articles of the Islaz Proclamation were to be amended. The ruler would be chosen for life, rather than elected to a five-year term; the national guard was to be renamed the civic guard; universal

---

[99] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 82-129.
[100] *Anul 1848*, II, 538-540; Hitchins, *Romanians*, 247-248.
[101] *Anul 1848,* II, 607-8. 'Alors ces mêmes individus, saisissant cette nouvelle circonstance si favorable a leurs vues, ont eu l'audace de former une nouvelle administration illégale sous le nom de Gouvernement provisoire en remplacement de celui qui était légitimement constitué et confié aux soins du sus dit Prince par S.M. Le Sultan. Ces actes sont non seulement incompatibles avec les droits de la suzeraineté et avec les principes du Gouvernement de la S.P., mais ils sont encore de nature à amener toutes sortes d'innovations contraires au maintien de l'ordre et de la tranquillité dans le pays… le Gouvernement provisoire, illégalement formé dans la Principauté, doit être immédiatement dissous ; qu'une personnes digne de confiance doit être nommée sans le moindre retard en qualité de Lieutenant, conformément aux dispositions du Règlement Organique…'
[102] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 8 August 1848, TNA, FO 78/742, 260r.

suffrage would be replaced with a franchise limited to those who could read; and the income of the dedicated monasteries, which supported religious orders in Constantinople, would be protected.[103] Magheru expressed his outrage in a letter to the Provisional Government. Two-and-a-half months of planning had gone into the Islaz Proclamation. It had been accepted without modification by the ruling prince and with the unanimous support of the people. The Metropolitan had blessed it on Liberty Field and declared it the Wallachian constitution. The Provisional Government had resisted the counterrevolutions of 1 and 11 July with the help of the people of Bucharest, but now this new Princely Lieutenancy had relinquished the country's internal autonomy, which was one of the proclamation's central tenets. Its members, Magheru wrote, had 'gone against our rights and raised the white flag of surrender.'[104] But the change in government had the desired effect. Suleiman recognised the Princely Lieutenancy and invited the foreign consuls to do likewise. He urged the absent boyars to return to Bucharest to support the new legitimate government.[105] The first phase of the revolution was over.

Ottoman recognition enabled the Princely Lieutenancy to begin laying the foundations of a new administrative order. Personnel changes in local government had begun in June. Local 'governors' had been replaced with new 'administrators,' and these men were instructed to repopulate their offices with enthusiastic revolutionaries, but it was only after the appointment of the Princely Lieutenancy that the government started to get to grips with the machinery of state and begin its efforts to reform it.[106] The new Interior Minister, C.A. Rosetti, wrote to the heads of the quarantine, the police, the prison system, the municipal council, and the Bucharest city government on 23 August to request reports on the structure and functions of each body within their departments.[107] Similar requests were sent to the Finance Minister, the Justice Minister, and the Minister of Control, whose department oversaw government spending.[108] Rosetti had complained of his and his peers' lack of

---

[103] The dedicated monasteries controlled around twelve percent of the land in Wallachia. They provided financial support to Greek shrines in Constantinople. Tell to Magheru, 14 August 1848. BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 4. Also reprod in *Anul 1848*, III, 167-168.

[104] Magheru to Locotenența Domnească, 16 August 1848, BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 202-203, 203r. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 226-229. '…Guvernul numit Locotenență, se facă în contra drepturilor noastre socotinduse aseminea lucrări ca niște hîrtii albe.'

[105] BAR, Mss Rom 3832, 232-233. For a Romanian translation of the original, see *Anul 1848,* III, 144-145.

[106] See chapter 3 on changes in local administrations.

[107] *Anul 1848,* III, 354.

[108] Their replies can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 183, 187, 191. The report of the Minister of Control is at BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 188. The report of the Head of the Bucharest Municipal Council can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 189 & 202. The report of the Bucharest Police Chief can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 193-194 & 197-198. For the report. of the Quarantine Commission, see *Anul 1848,* III, 377-379. And for the report of the head of the Prison System, see *Anul 1848,* III, 381-383.

government experience in July, and in August he set about rectifying his own shortcomings. The reports he received offer valuable insight into the functioning of the mid-nineteenth-century Wallachian state. The Bucharest Police Department, for instance, was not only responsible for apprehending criminals and maintaining good order. It located runaway children, gathered statistics, ensured the city was supplied with bread and meat, lit the streetlamps in the evenings, and researched the city's prostitutes and ensured they sought hospital treatment for venereal disease.[109] Rosetti's fact-finding mission was one part of a broader effort to reform the state. The Princely Lieutenancy appointed eight commissions on 15 August to draw up plans. One was tasked with writing a new constitution. Another was to reorganise the judicial system and a third the military. Three more were charged with reforming the bureaucracy, the financial administration of the state, and public schooling, and the final two commissions were responsible for promoting agriculture, industry, and commerce, and undertaking new public works schemes.[110] A Public Works Committee had existed in Bucharest under the Organic Regulations, but this new commission extended the work across the principality.

The Princely Lieutenancy prized expertise and experience in choosing men to implement its ambitious new programme of economic and governmental reform. Several of its appointees had served in similar roles before the revolution. Petrache Poenaru, who is best remembered for patenting a fountain pen while living in France in 1827, had served as Director of the Schools Commission during the 1830s and 1840s. He was appointed to the new Schools Commission alongside Ion Heliade Rădulescu, the historian A.T. Laurian, the journalist Cezar Bolliac, and Nicolae Crețulescu, who had studied medicine alongside Gustave Flaubert in Paris.[111] One of the men responsible for promoting agriculture, industry, and commerce was a merchant called 'Xanto,' and the French engineer Jean Baptiste Marsillon was added to the Public Works Commission on 17 August. Marsillon had previously designed the capital's new system of water pumps in 1847, and he set to his task with zeal. A little over a week after his appointment he complained to Rosetti that it had proven impossible to organise a meeting of the commission. Several of its members were absent and others were reluctant to accept the mission with which they had been entrusted. He suggested that each man should receive a formal order to attend meetings three times a

[109] BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 193-194.
[110] For the appointment of the commissions and the names of the commissioners, see BAR, Mss Rom, 3862, 155. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 194-195.
[111] Crețulescu was also named to the Public Works Commission.

week, and he recommended that an architect be appointed to augment the commission.[112] Rosetti agreed with Marsillon's recommendation. He appointed Jules Vilacrosse to be the resident architect on 3 September, but whatever grand plans Marsillon might have had for the principality's infrastructure would go unrealised.[113] The Princely Lieutenancy didn't hold power for long enough.

The Princely Lieutenancy fell because Ottoman policy changed. Russian opposition to the revolution had never wavered, and the leaders of the Wallachian Revolution recognised that their geopolitical position was precarious. They adapted and moderated their political programme to meet the exigencies of Great Power politics. Suleiman's recognition had given the government a sense of legitimacy and enabled it to begin building a new system of government in the principality, but unsettling rumours from Constantinople reached Bucharest in September. Suleiman was to be recalled and replaced by Fuad Effendi, and the French consul reported that his mission was to 're-establish the old order of things.'[114] On 15 September he reported that 'day by the day, the news from Constantinople grows more desperate.'[115] Robert Colquhoun shared Hory's concerns. He had heard stories that the Porte had 'come into the views of Russia, in so far as almost to have disavowed the acts of Suleyman Pacha, who is thought to have exceeded the strict line of his instruction.'[116] Confirmation of the change in Ottoman policy arrived on 22 September when Fuad addressed Metropolitan Neofit from his encampment outside the city. 'As of today,' he wrote, 'the city of Bucharest is placed under the safeguard of the Ottoman Army.' The police and city militia were instructed to 'maintain public order and the tranquillity of the city,' and advised that 'the greatest care must be taken that the hotels of the representatives of the friendly powers of the Sublime Porte are respected as well as the property of their nationals.'[117] In a final act of defiance, the Foreign Secretary refused to publish Fuad's proclamation. He told Neofit that the Princely Lieutenancy had been chosen by the people

[112] BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 178. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 400.
[113] BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 184. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 597.
[114] Hory to Aupick, 8 September 1848. CAD 166PO/E/168. 'Fuad Effendi… avait mission d rétablir, avant tout, l'ancien ordre de choses en Valachie.'
[115] Hory to Aupick, 15 September 1848. CAD 166PO/E/168. '…les esprits étaient dans une grande effervescence causée par les nouvelles de Constantinople qui deviennent de jour en jour plus désespérantes pour le succès de la cause Valaque.'
[116] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 6 September 1848, TNA, FO 78/743, 9r.
[117] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCXXIV/151. 'La ville de Bucharest est mise, dès aujourd'hui, sous la sauvegarde de l'armée impériale… Une grave responsabilité va peser, dans ce moment, sur le chef de la police et sur ses subalternes. Le devoir de la police ainsi que de la milice est de veiller strictement au maintien de l'ordre public et de la tranquillité de la ville, j'espère qu'elles sauront remplir leur devoir et s'acquitter de leur responsabilité. La police veillera surtout, avec le plus grand soin, a ce que les hôtels des Représentans [sic] des Puissances amies de la Sublime Porte soient respectés ainsi que les propriétés de leurs nationaux.'

and recognised by Suleiman Pasha in the name of the Sultan. It would remain the 'legal government of the Principality until it had been officially dissolved by the same powers that constituted it.'[118] His objections counted for little. The Ottoman army entered the city on 25 September. The experiment in revolutionary government was over.

Revolution in the Streets

The outbreak of revolution in June 1848 turned the people of Bucharest into political actors and created a revolutionary community. It afforded them new opportunities to participate in the political process. Few of these had existed under the Organic Regulations. The city's electorate was restricted to men over twenty-five who owned property valued at 5,000 or more lei, and there was little in the way of a public political sphere in the Wallachian capital. The revolution changed all that, albeit briefly. Revolutionary leaders worked to foster a new political culture, and they heralded the deeds of the people in print and in ceremonies. Five new newspapers appeared, political clubs debated the issues of the day in private and public settings, and large-scale meetings and pageants took place at sites across the city. Politics was no longer the exclusive preserve of the wealthiest merchants and landowning boyars. It became a matter for the people, and it was experienced collectively as part of Bucharest's quotidian life.

Bonds of kinship and community played an important role in the spread of revolutionary politics, and participation cut across neighbourhood and class boundaries. The most illuminating work on this subject was done by Ioana Cristache-Panait in the early 1960s. Many of Bucharest's streets remained unnamed in 1848, but its houses had been numbered, and by studying the records of one of the commissions responsible for investigating revolutionary participants after 25 September Cristache-Panait showed that many revolutionary activists lived in close proximity to one another. The residents of houses 1084, 1085, and 1087 in the North Bucharest neighbourhood of Precupeții Vechi were all interrogated for their involvement in revolutionary politics, and so were the inhabitants of houses 406, 407, and 410 in the nearby Mahala Caimata. Many were labourers, and most were likely young: seventy-five of the seventy-seven people called before the commission in

[118] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCXXIV/152. '…elle demeure de droit et de fait le gouvernement légal de la Principauté, tant qu'elle n'aura pas été officiellement dissoute par les mêmes pouvoirs qui l'ont constituée.'

the city's northern district were unmarried.[119] The thirteen dead and wounded from the struggle against Odobescu and his soldiers on 1 July came from twelve different neighbourhoods. They included a coachman called Stoica, a tailor named Dumitrache, and a manufacturer of a traditional item of peasant clothing made of wool—an *aba*—whose name was Panait.[120] The confectioner Toma Gheorghiu was celebrated by twenty-eight of his peers in a petition to the government to recognise his heroic deeds on the same day. He had shown personal bravery, and his emphatic words had 'stirred the blood of many in the crowd.' None of the signatories of this petition was a prominent revolutionary figure, and only one or two appear elsewhere in the revolutionary record. They were most likely Gheorghiu's friends, neighbours, and relations who had stood alongside him on 1 July.[121]

Crowds were a common sight in Bucharest during the revolutionary summer, and they attested to the people's political engagement. Around 20,000 people attended the funerals for the dead of 1 July, but not all gatherings attracted so many people.[122] Proclamations were read by priests to their congregants outside church doors, and small crowds collected every evening to hear the day's news.[123] 'It is curious,' wrote the British consul Colquhoun, 'to observe the eagerness for news among the lower classes, most of whom are unable to read themselves.' They gathered in 'little assemblages' at the end of the workday, listened as the day's newspapers were read, and then 'quietly' dispersed when the reader was finished.[124] The newspapers carried news of current events, but they also featured long-form political essays that were often serialised across a number of issues. *Popolul Suveran* featured an explanation of the constitution during August and September, and a piece published in *Pruncul Român* in July discussed concepts of property and the right of society to expropriate land for the common good if it gave compensation in lieu.[125] Reports from across Europe were common too, and these helped to foster a shared sense of purpose and a common European identity. 'Padua has escaped Austrian tyranny,' reported *Popolul Suveran* on 18 August. 'The scenes from Sicily have been repeated…the people are once again sovereign in

[119] Ioana Cristache-Panait, 'Unele probleme privind situația din București după 13 septembrie 1848', *Studii*, 16 (1963), 887-902, 890-891.
[120] *Anul 1848,* III, 577.
[121] One petitioner, Stoian, shared his surname. *Anul 1848,* I, 708. '…Așa înfierbântând sânge în cel mai mult număr de norod.'
[122] The estimate is Colquhoun's. See Colquhoun to Palmerston, 4 July 1949. TNA, FO 78/742, 131r.
[123] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 24 June 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 102v.
[124] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 22 July 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 198r-v.
[125] For the *Popolul Suveran* article on the constitution see *Anul 1848,* II, 761-771. The *Pruncul Român* piece on property was reproduced at *Anul 1848,* II, 140-144.

the city.'[126] The inhabitants of Bologna had 'decided that it is better to fight until their last drop of blood than to suffer under Austrian yoke,' and there were many stories from France, Denmark, Austria, Transylvania, and Britain.[127] There were even reports on the potato famine in Ireland and the likelihood of a revolution against British rule.[128] Like the French Revolution of 1789 before it, events in Bucharest in 1848 had fostered a new sense of contemporaneity in the minds the city's inhabitants.[129] And the continental horizons of the revolutionary movement helped them to understand themselves as part of something bigger than just Bucharest or Wallachia. Politics was a European experience.

Revolutionary leaders were keen to foster the development of a European political culture in the Wallachian capital. Alexandru G. Golescu—'the black'—advised Nicolae Bălcescu on 7 July that the city's new clubs and newspapers were weak and would require financial support.[130] The government offered it. The editor of the German-language gazette *Romania* solicited investment from the Foreign Minister, Ion Voinescu II, in August. He told Voinescu that there were too few German speakers in the city for his paper to survive on subscriptions alone, and he had exhausted his material resources.[131] Voinescu duly recommended his cause to the Princely Lieutenancy. The newspaper had 'warmly embraced the principles of the constitution,' and not only had it helped to spread its cause among the German-speaking peoples of the city, it had also served to 'refute the calumnies against the revolution placed in the foreign press by our enemies.'[132] A strong civic political culture could be good for the principality's European standing, too.

But the impetus for popular revolutionary activity didn't only come from above. Spontaneous acts were common from the beginning. The most dramatic was the defence of the Provisional Government against Odobescu's attempted coup, which the Bucharest correspondent for *Gazeta de Transilvania* described as the revolution's 'baptism of blood.'[133] Within fifteen minutes of the alarm being raised, the courtyard of the Provisional

---

[126] *Popolul Suveran,* 6/18 August 1848. BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXIX/4, 2r. 'Padova a scăpat de subt jugul Austriei… Scenele vederolor Siciliane se repetă îndată… Popolul este îndată suveran în cetate…'
[127] *Popolul Suveran,* 20 August/1 September 1848. BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXIX/4, 10v. 'Locuitorii Bolonii sunt hotărăți mai bine să se bată pănă la cea din urma picătură de sănge, de cât să sufere jugul Austraiacilor.'
[128] For Ireland, see 13/25 August, BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXIX/4, 6v and 16/28 August, BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXIX/4, 8v.
[129] On the French Revolution, see Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present,* 11-54.
[130] Golescu was nicknamed 'the black' to distinguish him from his cousin Alexandru C. Golescu 'the white'. For Golescu's letter see *Anul 1848,* II, 94-95.
[131] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 182.
[132] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 181. 'aquea gazetă a înbrațișatii cu căldură princpele constituții; că ținta ei de căpetenie este a refuta calomniile respîndite asupra revoluții nóstre în jurnalele streine, de réoa voință a vrejmașilor noștri…'
[133] *Anul 1848,* I, 700. 'Revoluțiunea noastră primi eri baptisma sângelui.'

Government's palace was 'filled with the national guard & people, who completely hemmed in the small detachment of soldiers.'[134] Many had seized weapons from the sword smith Andreas Trecsler, whose shop stood alongside the Creţulescu Church a short walk from the palace.[135] Others carried fowling rifles. One of the popular leaders was a woman named Ana Ipătescu. She was born in 1805 into a petit-bourgeois family on the edge of the Armenian Quarter to the east of the city centre. Her father Atanasie Ghiulerasă was a merchant with two shops on Podul Tîrgului de Afară (today's Calea Moşilor), but after her parent's divorce and her father's remarriage she fell on hard times. Her first husband, Ivancea Dimitru, was a violent man, and the marriage was dissolved in 1831, the same year that her father died of cholera.[136] She married Nicolae Ipătescu a year later. He was a minor functionary in the Treasury Department and an active supporter of the revolution in 1848 along with his brothers Grigore and Constantin.[137] But it was Ana whose involvement made the headlines. She leapt atop a carriage armed with two pistols and called the people to arms; 'even when bullets whistled about her, she didn't flee from her place. She was carried in triumph to the palace, where she was acclaimed by the members of the government.'[138] The soldiers laid down their arms and Odobescu and Solomon were arrested. Seven deaths were recorded and eighteen people wounded.[139]

Ipătescu's deeds provided the revolution with its own mythology. She was celebrated by Heliade Rădulescu in his *Mémoires,* and the poet C.D. Aricescu penned several verses in her honour. These appeared in *Pruncul Român* on 18 July. 'See the woman,' he urged his readers 'with the body of an Amazon/with arms of brass, with the heart of a Wallachian,/ with her fiery features and her sparkling eyes.'[140] She was their Marianne, their Joan of Arc who

---

[134] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 1 July 1848, TNA, FO 78/742, 122r-v.
[135] Trecsler sought compensation for 200 sabres. See BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 189.
[136] Ipătescu attempted to recover some of her father's assets three years after his death. Her second husband Nicolae Ipătescu wrote a letter on her behalf to the Prince. See George Potra ed., *Documente privitoare la Istoria Oraşului Bucureşti 1821-1848,* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975), 409-410.
[137] For further biographical details, see I.M. Ştefan, *Ana Ipătescu,* (Bucureşti: Editura Militară, 1975) and Gh. T. Ionescu, 'Noi mărturii despre Ana Ipatescu', *Revista de Istorie*, 28 (1975), 329-344.
[138] Account taken from *Pruncul Român* on 4 July, reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 34. 'Aci trebue să mai vorbim de o faptă eroică a unei dame române, care de la început, când se arestui Guvernul provisoiu, se află faţă la toate întîmplările; stând într'o trăsură, armată cu două pistoale, vorbi popolului chemându-l la apărarea Guvernului, la luarea armelor, se expuse cu vitejie, cu despreţuirea morţii, primejdiei celei mai mari şi chiar când gloanţele şuerau împrejurul ei, nu-şi părăsi locul; pe urmă fu dusă în triumph sus la palat, unde fu primită cu cele mai vii aclamaţii de membriii Guvernului.'
[139] For the French consul's account of these events, see Hory to Aupick, 1 July 1848, CAD, 166PO/E/168; for the Russian version, see Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele ruseşti, 144-148.* Both are materially similar to Colquhoun's, which forms the basis of the description given here.
[140] Aricescu, 'Odă,' reprod. in *1848 în Principatele Române, Album Apărat sub Îngrijirea Comitetului de Direcţie pentru Sârbătorirea Centenarului Anului Revoluţionar 1848,* (Bucureşti: Editat de Revista « Arcades », 1948), 97. 'Văzut-aţi, zic, femeea, cu trup de amazoană,/Cu braţul de aramă, cu inima romană,/Cu faţa'n flăcărată, cu ochi scânteietori…'

'slapped the tyrant and spat in his face.'[141] Her actions were celebrated abroad, too. Alexandru G. Golescu reported to Nicolae Bălcescu at the end of July that all the newspapers in Vienna had carried Ipătescu's story, and some forty thousand pamphlets had been printed to help 'shape the popular morale in Vienna.'[142] This news must have delighted revolutionary leaders. One of their own heroines could stand as an example for all Europe.

The second attempted counterrevolution brought popular anxieties and anger bubbling to the surface. Odobescu's attempted coup had interrupted the rhythms of the city's nascent political culture, and the departure of the Provisional Government on 10 July and the establishment of a conservative Caimacamie threatened to break it. Colquhoun reported that as the news of the Provisional Government's flight and a possible Russian invasion spread through the city 'the tricolored flags which floated in every street disappeared, as did also the cockades, and not a single national guard was seen after ten o'clock. The city is as it was before the 23rd.'[143] The conservative Ion Voinescu I celebrated this change. He wrote in his diary that 'the whole city enjoys the greatest calm,' but not everybody shared his opinion.[144] The police officers of the old regime patrolled the streets once again, and they meted out punishment with their former zeal. Colquhoun reported that in the morning of 12 July two of these agents 'severely beat' some butchers at one of the city's markets. Were it not for this violence, Colquhoun reckoned, then the counterrevolutionaries might have succeeded in restoring the old order, but they had offended the community. A deputation of merchants protested to the Metropolitan. 'As their numbers increased,' wrote Colquhoun, 'so did the style of their language, till at length they accused the Metropolitan of perjury.' Soldiers were summoned to disperse them, and they resorted to violence, which brought forth the fury of the people. 'At about 12 o'clock,' Colquhoun wrote, 'the whole city poured forth its population. The different trades, as bodies, assembled before the Metropolitan Palace, and insisted that the Provisional Government should be immediately recalled and re-instated in their office. The Metropolitan acquiesced, but this didn't satisfy everyone. Small parties of young men broke the windows of Emanuil Băleanu, who was one of the members of the brief Caimacamie, and they 'razed' the house of one of the most hated police officers to the

---

[141] Aricescu, 'Odă,' 97. 'Este Ana Jan-d'Arc a României,/Ce numai cu cuvântul, în epoca sclaviei,/A pălmuit tiranul în fața lui scuipând.'

[142] *Anul 1848,* II, 616. 'fapta d-nei Ipătescu dă un luciu și un interest nespus causei noastre; toate gazetele din Viena au descries această faptă și vre-o 40,000 exemplare, foi volante, s'au tipărit cu această faptă antică spre formarea moralului populului din Viena.'

[143] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 11 July 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 166v.

[144] Quoted in Constantin Rezachevici & Valeriu Stan, 'Memoriile istorice ale colonelului Ion Voinescu I, un izvor inedit privitor la istoria politică a veacului al XIX-lea. Fragmente referitoare la revoluția de la 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 835-849, 846. '…tot orașul se bucura de cea mai mare liniște.'

ground.[145] Voinescu I witnessed these scenes. He recorded that 'many houses were looted and damaged, many people mistreated by the sovereign people, inflamed by anarchists, even if the motto of their constitution was "Respect for People, Respect for Property.'[146] Voinescu I's account shows some of the ways that the people of Bucharest had transformed the revolution. The Islaz Proclamation was an ideological statement, but the people experienced revolution as a cultural and emotional phenomenon.[147]

New modes of sociability flourished, corporations and trade associations became loci of revolutionary culture, and clubs thrived. William Sewell has written about how trade organisations in Paris became units of revolutionary participation. The 'sovereign people,' he wrote, presented themselves as 'an aggregation of workers' corporations,' and the same was true in Wallachia.[148] Artisans collected in trades to protest against police violence during the second failed counterrevolution, and representatives of the corporations met Suleiman Pasha at the gates of the city. Commercial bodies became revolutionary bodies, but there were also new modes of political and commercial association in the city. A Commercial Association met at Zamfir's Inn on the edge of the commercial district of Lipscani and discussed the possibility of a starting a new course in political economy, while clubs discussed all the pressing issues of the day.[149] They had overcome the weaknesses described by A.G. Golescu in early July and developed into important spaces of revolutionary sociability. All were welcome to attend meetings and subjects of discussion were publicised. A note in *Popolul Suveran* on 14 August reported the debates about the upcoming elections that had taken place the previous evening at the Regeneration Club, and a short piece appeared in *Pruncul Român* the following day advertising the establishment of a new club to debate the articles of the constitution and discuss the changes from the Organic Regulations. 'Those who want to take part in this honourable meeting,' it advised, 'are asked to go to Herăstrău between five and eight in the evening.'[150] The discussion would take place in the open. Costache Halepliu attested to the vibrancy of the city's clubs in his confession to the commission researching the revolution. He named several people who were involved. One Mavromați—first name unknown—was a

---

[145] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 13 July 1848, TNA, FO 78/742, 173v-175v.
[146] Quoted in Rezachevici, 'Memoriile istorice,' 846. '…reîntoarcerea lor în Captailă fu inaugurată prin scene deplorabile: multe case fură jefuite și dărăpănate, multe personae maltratate de poporul suveran întarîtat de anarhiști, deși deviza juratei constituții era: Respect persoanelor, respect proprietății.'
[147] For more on popular involvement in putting down counterrevolution, see Ioana Panait & P.I. Panait, 'Participarea maselor populare din București la înfrîngerea comploturilor reacțiunii din iunie 1848', *Studii*, 13.6 (1960), 83-98.
[148] Sewell, *Work and Revolution,* 262.
[149] Fl. Georgescu, 'Anul revoluționar,' 262.
[150] *Anul 1848,* III, 158 & 207. 'Cei ce doresc a lua parte la această onorabilă adunanță, sînt rugați a merge în toate zilele la Herăstrău, de la 5 ore pînă la 8 ale serei…'

major in the National guard and the secretary of a democratic club. Ștefan Mihăileanu was a captain of the Guard, and he spoke up in debates all over the city to advocate taking up arms against the boyars. Manolache was a member of the same club as Mavromați, and Costache Arion and Nicu Andronescu helped Mavromați organise meetings. The latter also held an official position within the city administration. And then there was the young Bacalolu, whose sense of the revolutionary community extended beyond Wallachia. He argued that the Wallachians should arm themselves and go to war with any country that dared to attack them. France, Germany, Transylvania, and England, he said, would all rally to the Wallachian cause.[151] Some meetings took place in public and others convened in private residences. The same Petre Orbescu who discussed events in Paris and Vienna with his class at school told the investigating committee that he had attended club meetings in the house of a man called Apolonie, although he said he hadn't spoken up.[152] There were likely many others like Orbescu who preferred to listen and murmur support rather than deliver speeches themselves. The public gallery for the Property Commission in August was always full, and many attendees cheered and echoed the words of the deputies.[153]

Clubs offered the people a space to vent their political grievances, but they also provided an institutional framework for the revolution. In a letter to George Bariț a correspondent who signed himself only as 'I.P.' complained that they were little more than echo chambers. 'Everybody shared the same opinion and nobody disagreed,' he wrote, and he doubted whether these debates would serve as a vehicle for progress.[154] Discussions often centred upon attendees' hatred for the old regime. The French consul Hory reported 'serious debate in the democratic clubs' on the question of property in late August. 'Violent motions,' he wrote, 'were raised against the landowners who had called for a Russian occupation to restore the old system of privileges, abuses, and oppression', and threats were made against the lives of conservative boyars, several of whom fled the capital.[155] But club activities weren't only limited to debate. The members of the Metropolitan Club, for instance, established a subscription to pay for the uniforms of those national guardsmen who couldn't afford to buy them themselves.[156]

---

[151] ANIC 601/41/1849, 6-7.
[152] ANIC 601/25/1849, 3r.
[153] See chapter three.
[154] *Anul 1848,* III, 93. 'Cluburi se fac mai în toate serile. Desbaterile sînt rătăcite și opiniile mai de un fel, oposiții nu se fac. De unde va eși adevărul dar?'
[155] Hory to Aupick, 31 August 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168. 'Cette question a soulevé de graves débates dans les clubs démocratiques. De violentes motions y ont été faites contre les propriétaires qui passent pour appeler dans le pays l'occupation Russe, à l'effet de rétablir l'ancien système de privilèges, d'abus et d'oppression.'
[156] *Anul 1848,* IV, 221.

The attendees of club meetings were predominantly drawn from the artisanal and merchant communities, but the population of Bucharest as a whole had swollen with peasants during the summer. Bucharest's floating population stood at between ten and twelve thousand under the Organic Regulations, and during the summer of 1848 that number expanded dramatically. One estimate put the number of peasants in the city in late August as high as fifteen thousand, and R.G. Colquhoun reckoned there were as many as thirty thousand by the end of September.[157] Some of the city's inhabitants were anxious in the first week of the revolution. The jubilation of 23 June had subsided, and those peasants started to look threatening. 'There was a feeling of alarm expressed among the boiars and the merchants,' wrote Colquhoun on 27 June, 'lest these peasants arriving in masses might be tempted to plunder.'[158] The government encouraged many to return to their villages, but others evidently stayed on. A map that Colquhoun sent to London after the revolution's defeat showed five peasant encampments arranged to the south and west of the city.[159] Their presence would prove a serious problem for the police after 25 September. Its records are littered with descriptions of people who had no means of supporting themselves in the city, many of whom wore poor-quality clothing and others Germanic and Hungarian dress, suggesting that some had come over from Transylvania.[160]

Public meetings provided an important locus for revolutionary political culture, and they brought together the diverse populations living in and around Bucharest during the summer. The best-attended and most consequential meetings took place on Liberty Field, which became the beating heart of revolutionary popular politics in the Wallachian capital. It was located to the south of the city, beyond the Dâmbovița River and the Metropolitan Palace, on land occupied today by Carol I Park and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Before the revolution it had been known as Filaret Field, and it was a popular promenading site for the well-to-do boyars of Bucharest during the first half of the nineteenth-century.[161] But like Zucotti Park in New York City, a favoured destination for financial services workers with bagged lunches that was overrun in September 2011 by the activists of Occupy Wall

---

[157] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 28 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 57r.
[158] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 27 June 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 107r.
[159] TNA, FO 78/743, 66.
[160] BAR, Mss Rom 3873. See, for instance, f77 for a Tudor Limonțiu who wore 'haine proaste', f119 for a Tudor Bărbieru, who wore 'haine nemțești', and f256 for a Dumitru in 'haine ungurești'. The descriptions also give physical characteristics and ages and offer an invaluable resource both for the study of measures taken after 25 September as well as the social backgrounds of people suspected of involvement in the revolution itself. See chapter five for a discussion of the police's work to remove these people from the capital.
[161] For a discussion of promenading in the two Danubian Principalities, see Dan Dumitru Iacob, *Elitele din Principatele Române în Prima Jumătate a Secolului al XIX-lea: Sociabilitate și Divertisment*, (Iași: Editura Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, 2015), 111-138.

Street, the pleasant environs of Filaret Field were transformed into a space for revolutionary politics. Thousands gathered on 27 June to celebrate the new constitution. A note was sent to the Minister of War, Ion Odobescu, instructing him that the entire city garrison was expected to present itself at ten o'clock in the morning together with artillery guns to perform a salute, and the Bucharest Police Chief was ordered to ensure that all the city's boyars attended.[162] Ion Voinescu II delivered the opening speech, and he emphasised that it was a special occasion. 'Brothers,' he began, 'we are not gathered here today for this ceremony to celebrate a saint or any other ordinary celebration, but for the consecration of this national flag, which is raised to guarantee the dearest and most holy rights of a nation.'[163] The people were not simple passive spectators in this ceremony. Each attendee was invited to take an oath to uphold the new constitution and support the revolutionary community. They swore to be 'faithful to the will of the Wallachian people' and to 'never work against the national interest.' They would 'keep and defend the twenty-one points' of the Islaz Proclamation, and they would work for them with all their might and sacrifice their lives for the cause of the constitution and the Wallachian nation.[164] Henric Winterhalder of the printing firm of Rosetti & Winterhalder brought one of his presses out for the occasion. It was driven on a chariot, and Winterhalder and another man stood atop it and waved the revolutionary tricolour while other men distributed freshly printed copies of a poem that celebrated the abolition of censorship and the new freedom of the press.[165] 'Brothers,' it read, 'the bell calls us/The Standard of Liberty/Today will be consecrated.'[166] Many of those who received a copy of the poem were unlikely to be able to read it, but that didn't matter. There was a symbolic value to each sheet. It was a souvenir. It attested to its recipient's participation in the revolutionary celebrations, and the object itself was as important as the words printed on it.

The celebrations of 27 June were billed as an extraordinary event, but meetings on Liberty Field became a facet of quotidian life during the revolution. The people gathered there to issue a protest against the entrance of Ottoman troops into Wallachia on 1 August, and it was on Liberty Field that the Provisional Government delivered its resignation and the

---

[162] *Anul 1848,* I, 557-558; *Anul 1848,* I, 561.
[163] *Anul 1848,* I, 590-591. 'Fraților! Noi astăzi nu sîntem adunați la această solemnitate spre a celebra vre-un sfînt sau pentru vre-o altă sărbătoare obicinuită, ci pentru sfințirea acestor steaguri naționale, cari se înalță pentru asigurarea drepturilor celor mai scumpe, celor mai sfinte ale unei nații…'
[164] *Anul 1848,* I, 591-592. 'Jur… că voiu fi credincios voinței nației Romîne…jur că nu voiu lucra nici odată în contra intereselor nației, și că voiu ține și apăra acele doue-zeci și unu punturi decretate de popol, conlucrând după putință-mi și jertfind vieața mea chiar pentru dînsele și pentru nație.'
[165] For the printing bill, see BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 103-105; Angela Jianu, *A Circle of Friends: Romanian Revolutionaries and Political Exile, 1840-1859,* (Leiden, NL: Brill Balkan Studies Library, 2012), 80-81; for the poem, see *Anul 1848,* I, 523. It is mistakenly identified as having been distributed on 23 June.
[166] *Anul 1848,* I, 523. 'Frați, clopotul ne cheamă,/Stindardul Libertății/Azi se va consacra…'

people chose the first Princely Lieutenancy.[167] Robert Colquhoun estimated that more than seven thousand people attended, and public meetings were especially popular with the more radical revolutionary faction.[168] Nicolae Bălcescu complained to A.G. Golescu on 17 August that C.A. Rosetti and Ion Brătianu were 'always arranging public meetings on Liberty Field and making all sorts of trouble.'[169] Rosetti edited his own newspaper, but he understood the importance of ritual, ceremony, and face-to-face interaction in popular politics. The public meetings, like those of the revolutionary clubs, gave people an opportunity to express themselves and talk back to their leaders. Their responses could take many forms, and Liberty Field became a venue of what Paul Pickering described in an essay on Chartism as 'class without words.' The symbolic landscape was just as important as the speeches delivered.[170]

The rechristening of Liberty Field was part of a broader attempt to create a new revolutionary topography of Bucharest. Filaret Field recalled the eighteenth-century Metropolitan Filaret. The new name commemorated that sacred day when 'all the classes of society embraced and swore their belief in the will of the people.' The change was executed by the Provisional Government one day after the celebrations, and it was done with explicit reference to the events of the previous day.[171] Liberty was not an abstract political concept. It was part of the revolutionary experience, and other symbolic changes were planned and enacted, too. A statue of a woman representing Wallachia and carrying the twin symbols of justice and Christianity was erected outside the treasury in late June, and in mid-August there were plans to raise statues of Gheorghe Lazăr, who was a pioneer of Romanian-language education in the principality, the medieval Prince Mihai Viteazul, and the 1821 revolutionary Tudor Vladimirescu.[172] Paris likely served as a model for ideas about the transformation of public space. The Revolution of 1789 had toppled statues of kings and replaced them with representations of liberty, and the 1848 revolution offered similar hopes to the city's sculptors

[167] For the protest, see *Anul 1848,* II, 642-643.
[168] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 5 August 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 235r.
[169] Bălcescu to A.G. Golescu, 17 August 1848. Reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere* IV, 104. 'Roset și I. Brătianu s-au făcut tribuni și aranghează mereu publicul în Cîmpul Libertății, făcînd feluri de necuviințe.'
[170] See Paul Pickering, 'Class without Words: Symbolic Communication in the Chartist Movement', *Past & Present* 112 (1986), 144-162.
[171] *Anul 1848,* I, 617. 'Guvernul provisoriu dorind a se păstra neștearsă aducerea aminte a solemnității serbate în 15 Iunie în câmpul Filaretuli, solenitate în care toate clasele soțietății se înfrățiră și jurară credință voinței popolului…'
[172] For a reference to the existence of the statue outside the treasury, see *Anul 1848,* II, 324. It was torn down under the brief Caimacamie of early July; Fl. Georgescu, 'Anul Revoluționar,' 261; on the plastic arts more generally, see Adrian-Silvan Ionescu, 'Momentul 1848 în plastica documentaristă', *Revista Istorică*, XV (1999), 501-518.

and architects.[173] The painter Pellerin dreamed of the glorious work he would do in the service of the Republic in Gustave Flaubert's *l'Éducation Sentimentale.* 'Soon,' he declared, 'Paris would be covered with gigantic monuments which he would decorate; he had already started work on a picture of the Republic.'[174] Not all of the changes to the city's landscape were meant to be permanent. The artist C.D. Rosenthal was commissioned to erect a temporary triumphal arch for the visit of Suleiman Pasha. He rode underneath it as he processed down Podul Mogoșoaiei to meet the new Princely Lieutenancy. It had cost the government 8,800 lei, but it offered an important symbolic message: the Ottoman representative was recognising the victory of the revolutionary cause.[175]

Suleiman's visit was one of the grand pageants of the revolution. Carriages were sent to Giurgiu to bring him and his delegation to Bucharest, and Prince Bibescu's palace was readied to receive him. New furniture was bought, and instructions were given to illuminate the city streets.[176] A special ballroom and kiosk were constructed in the public gardens to host a grand banquet with an evening of entertainment. The Italian opera singer Montresor was contracted to perform against a backdrop supplied by the artist Barbu Iscovescu, who painted a portrait of the Sultan surrounded by flowers and the twenty-one articles of the Wallachian constitution.[177] Loyalty to the Porte was a significant feature of these celebrations, but so too was the revolution's popularity in the city. The Pasha was met at the gates by deputations from the various merchant and artisan corporations, and they offered him a traditional gift of bread and salt alongside the keys to the city.[178] No expense was spared. A commission established to investigate revolutionary expenditure found that the Princely Lieutenancy had spent more than 170,000 lei on the visit. Almost 13,000 lei went on decorations for the ballroom and pavilion alone—and that figure didn't include the 7,000 lei spent on the ballroom's construction.[179] Only seven hundred people were invited to attend the ball and just one hundred the dinner, but Suleiman's procession through the city streets could be

[173] Maurice Agulhon, *Marianne into Battle*, 36-7; For a book-length study of the transformation of public space in France during the revolutionary era, see J.A. Leith, *Space and Revolution: Projects for Monuments, Squares, and Public Buildings in France, 1789-1899,* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991). For a more specific study of the years around 1848, see T.J. Clark, *The Absolute Bourgeois, Artists and Politics in France 1848-1851,* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1982).
[174] Flaubert, *Sentimental Education,* 319. In the French: 'Paris, bientôt, serait couvert de monuments gigantesques ; il les décorerait ; il avait même commencé une figure de la République.'
[175] For Rosenthal's commission, see Ion Frunzetti, *Pictori Revoluționari de la 1848,* (București: Editura Meridiane, 1988), 47. For the cost of the arch see BAR, Mss Rom 3861, 478v-479r.
[176] BAR, Mss Rom 3861, 257, 37, 115 & 33. This entire volume is devoted to the spending on Suleiman's visit, and though some documents were reproduced in *Anul 1848,* the majority were not.
[177] BAR, Mss Rom 3861, 131 & 156; *Popolul Suveran,* 13 August 1848, found at BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXIX/4, 6v.
[178] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 22 August, 1848, TNA, FO 78/742, 282r.
[179] For the full report, see BAR, Mss Rom 3861, 473-485.

attended by all, and the smells and sounds of the banquet and concert must have carried beyond the walls of the temporary ballroom.[180] It was a celebration that could still be enjoyed by the people.

Pageantry offered catharsis during times of revolutionary uncertainty. A grand public funeral was held for the dead the day after Odobescu's failed putsch of 1 July. Robert Colquhoun estimated that more than twenty thousand people attended, and some estimates ran as high as thirty thousand.[181] No pictorial representations of the ceremony survive—if any were made—but it was a solemn affair that likely resembled the funeral for those killed in Berlin in March, which was memorialised by Adolph Menzel in his unfinished *Aufbahrung der Märzgefallen.* Speeches were delivered by Heliade Rădulescu and his young protégé George Crețeanu. 'No noble doctrine was ever established without martyrs,' declared Crețeanu, and he begged his audience to keep 'the names of the brave fallen' in their hearts, but the funeral was not only a ceremony of remembrance.[182] It was one of unity. Heliade Rădulescu was mindful of the possibility of violence, and he urged attendees to forgive those responsible for the deaths of their compatriots. 'The souls of these martyrs,' he said, 'who now stand before God, forgive the errant brothers who killed them; you too should forgive them so that they will see they are not our enemies, that they were deceived.'[183] The soldiers had gone against the revolutionary body, but they could be reclaimed.

The burning of the Organic Regulations on 18 September was a more inflammatory affair. Stories had begun to circulate that the Ottoman authorities in Constantinople had refused to grant an audience to a Wallachian delegation. The new Turkish Commissioner Fuad Effendi was said to have been charged with reinstating the Organic Regulations and the old regime, and the atmosphere in the city was febrile. 'The agitation among the people is very great,' reported Colquhoun on 11 September, 'and some of the popular orators rather increase and inflame this agitation.'[184] In scenes that were repeated on smaller scales in towns and villages across the principality, some ten thousand people gathered outside the Interior Ministry at six o'clock in the morning. They demanded the original copies of the Organic Regulations and the official register of boyar ranks, which were then placed on a bier, covered with a black shroud, and transported to the Metropolitan Palace. Funeral music and

---

[180] 700 invitations were printed for the ball and 100 for the dinner. See BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 105v.
[181] Fl. Georgescu, 'Anul Revoluționar,' 254; Colquhoun to Palmerston, 4 July 1848, TNA, FO 78/742, 131r.
[182] *Anul 1848,* I, 699. 'ori-ce nobilă doctrină nu se înființéză fără martiri…numele bravilor cari căzură eri vor rămâné înscrise în inimile Românilor…'
[183] *Anul 1848,* I, 696. 'Sufletele acestor martiri, ce stau acum înaintea lui Dumnezeu, eartă pe frații lor rătăciți cari -au ucis; ertați și voi ca să vază că n'au inimici, ca să vază că cu adevărat au fost amăgiți…'
[184] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 11 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 23v-24r.

the tolling of church bells accompanied the procession. Metropolitan Neofit cursed the two books that had 'brought misfortune to the country.'[185] A fire was lit, the books were cast upon it, and their ashes were scattered to the winds. Then the people 'separated in perfect order and the evening passed off quietly.'[186]

Several men who participated in the burning of the Organic Regulations claimed afterwards to have had no idea what they were doing, but their involvement speaks to the power of the new revolutionary political culture. When the sixty-year-old Vasile Dancovici was brought before the commission investigating the revolutionary events ten of his associates wrote in his defence. They informed the commission that Ion Brătianu had gone 'from shop to shop and told all the merchants to go to the Metropolitan's palace to hear the reading of an Ottoman firman.'[187] Other men offered similar excuses. The fifty-four-year-old merchant Scarlat Petrovici admitted that he had attended the auto-da-fé, but he said he had only been following others.[188] Peasants from villages in Teleorman and Argeș Counties said they didn't even know what the Organic Regulations contained.[189] These defences may have been true, but the people participated nonetheless, and they likely knew that the two books represented the old order. The burning in Bucharest was preceded by a repetition of the oath on the constitution, and Metropolitan Neofit described the two books as those which had 'brought unhappiness to the country.'[190] A template of revolutionary pageantry had been established by 18 September, and when Brătianu summoned the people to join, they followed.

Between the moments of high tension and pageantry the city settled into a day-to-day revolutionary routine. Both the French and the British consuls attested to the city's calm. Hory reported on 27 June that 'tranquillity reigned in the capital,' and within days of the failed second counterrevolution Colquhoun wrote that 'the most perfect order prevailed.'[191] In Late July he informed Lord Palmerston that he had taken up the habit of walking the city streets around midnight. It was, he wrote 'most quiet… strong patroles [sic] of the merchants paraded the town and the reports of the police speak for the good conduct of the

---

[185] *Anul 1848,* IV, 220. '…amândouă Regulamentele, adică manuscriptul și a doua ediție a Regulamentului, cât și Archondologhia, care făcuse nenoricirea țării…'
[186] The quotation comes from Colquhoun, but various consular accounts of these events exist. All present the same picture. See Colquhoun to Palmerston, 18 September 1848, TNA, FO 78/743, 45-46; Hory to Aupick, 19 September 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168; Kotzebue to Nesselrode, 23 September 1848, reprod. in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 259-261.
[187] ANIC, 601/61/1849, 8. '…a venit singur Brătianu din prăvălie în prăvălie, zicând să meargă neguțători la Prea Sfinția Sa părintele Mitropolitu, ca să se afle de față ca citirea unui înalt ferman.'
[188] ANIC, 601/16/1848, 7.
[189] ANIC, 601/6/1849; 601/7/1849; 601/10/1849, 2.
[190] *Anul 1848,* IV, 220-221.
[191] Hory to Aupick, 27 June 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168; Colquhoun to Palmerston, 18 July, TNA, FO78/742, 179v.

inhabitants.'[192] This peace endured for much of the summer. Colonel Nicolae Pleșoianu wrote to Gheorghe Magheru in mid-August that 'the world of Bucharest is happy, and everywhere one walks there is music.'[193]

Opposition to the revolution was scarce in Bucharest, but it did exist, and revolutionary figures attempted to check its influence. Nicolae Bălcescu reported to Ion Ghica in late July that there were still 'many reactionaries in the cities.'[194] He feared they were plotting in secret, though in a subsequent letter he wrote that the revolution was 'winning over the people more and more with each day.'[195] Satire and mockery were potent weapons in the struggle against the revolution's opponents. The 31 July edition of *Popolul Suveran* included a fictional account of a meeting of the 'Reactionary Club.' Its members expressed their horror at the freeing of Roma slaves and their outrage to see a merchant in government. One member said it was better that they all 'leave and go somewhere else.' They could form a new colony in another land and choose their ruler after the old Organic Regulations. 'But where should we go?' cried the attendees. 'To America,' answered one. 'The Caucasus would be better,' said another. 'Better still in Siberia,' said a third. 'Bravo,' cried the attendees. 'To Siberia, to Siberia!'[196] By September it seemed that the fight had been won. The British diplomat Effingham Grant told Ghica that all was 'quiet' in Bucharest and that 'even the reactionaries, although they are always scheming, show some confidence in the good proceedings of the government.'[197]

Bucharest's good order was the joint work of the government and the people. The city government took new measures to safeguard the capital's food supply. Swarms of locusts and outbreaks of epizootic disease had brought shortages during the summer and autumn of 1847. Prices had risen by as much as fifty percent and some staples were scarce.[198] The city council tried to avoid a repeat of the same struggles. It proposed to abandon the old regulatory system and entered negotiations with the bakers' and butchers' corporations to set standards of quality and maximum prices, which couldn't be raised without at least three

---

[192] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 22 July 1848, TNA, FO 78/742, 191r.
[193] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 58v. 'Lumea în București e veselă, mereu se plimbă cu muzica.' Also reprod. in *Anul 1848*, III, 32.
[194] Bălcescu to Ghica, 28 July 1848. Reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere* IV, 97. 'Prin orașe este încă mulți reacționari.'
[195] Bălcescu to Ghica, 30 July 1848. Reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere* IV, 99. 'Popolul îl cîștigăm din zi în zi mai mult.'
[196] BNR, Fond Brătianu, XXXIX/4, 33v. 'Nu, nu; mai bine că plecăm toți într-altă țară…Toți. Dar în ce parte de loc să mergem? Unul. În America? Altul. Mai bine în Caucaz. Altul. Mai bine în Siberie. Toți. Ura! Bravo! În Siberia, în Siberia!'
[197] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 8 September 1848, BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s7(2)/DCXVI, 2v-3r. 'Du cette tout est fort tranquille ici et même les réactionnaires, malgré qu'ils intriguent toujours, montrent de la confiance en quelque sorte dans les bons procédés du gouvernement.
[198] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 12 August 1847 & 13 September 1847. TNA, FO 78/697, 89-92.

months notice.[199] Soldiers were taught to bake bread, and in early September a new municipal baker was established and corporation regulations were loosened to increase the number of bakers.[200] The Aga of Police, Mărgărit Moșoiu, complained to the Interior Ministry on 17 August that holdovers from the old order still held office within his department and they were hindering police work, but many citizens took it upon themselves to help maintain order.[201] Some fifteen hundred people joined the city guard in the early days of the revolution, and around six thousand merchants enlisted across the summer.[202] Nicolae Bălcescu only exaggerated slightly when he wrote to Ion Ghica on 28 July and told him that 'all the merchants of Bucharest are revolutionaries.'[203] Some forty companies of National guardsmen existed by the end of August, and there were also five legions and ten military battalions in the city.[204] Many lacked weapons, but their simple participation demonstrates the extent to which the city's population were willing to work to maintain the city's order. Moșoiu's successor Ion Brătianu invited the people to do even more. In one of his earliest addresses he told them of the importance of the city's cleanliness, 'which not only affects your clothes, furniture, and carriages, but also your health.' He asked the people to help keep Bucharest clean. They were invited to sweep the street in front of their homes before eight o'clock in the morning, and told that those who didn't would be charged a half-zwanzig by the police to perform the task for them.[205] The cholera epidemic had passed by this point, but it had been replaced by an outbreak of 'fever & ague' the likes of which Robert Colquhoun had never seen in the city before.[206] A thousand copies of Brătianu's proclamation were distributed around the city, and six hundred of another that banned smoking in the streets appeared, too.[207] On 15 August the Princely Lieutenancy asked its citizens not to carry weapons outside of service in the National guard, and Brătianu renewed this call in the

[199] BAR, Doc Ist MXII/147; *Anul 1848,* II, 268.
[200] Fl. Georgescu, 'Anul revoluționar,' 261; *Anul 1848,* III, 708-711.
[201] For a list of all the Bucharest police in June 1848, see BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 188-190. For changes effected by Moșoiu see BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 209; BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 217.
[202] Fl. Georgescu, 'Anul revoluționar,' 261.
[203] Bălcescu, *Opere* IV, 99. 'Negustorimea toată din București este revoluționară.'
[204] Constantin Olteanu, 'Concepția conducătorilor revoluționari pașoptiști din țările române cu privire la puterea armată', *Revista de Istorie*, 32 (1979), 1055-1068.
[205] *Anul 1848,* III, 446. 'Fraților cetățeni! Poliția, care trebue să îngrijească de a se face tot c ear fi în folosu dumnea-voastră, n'a lipsit de a se gândi și la curățenia orașului, de la care atârnă nu numai păstrarea hainelor, mobilelor și echipagiurilor, ba încă chiar și a sănătății dumnea-voastră. Eată pentru ce Poliția a rugat, și ăși mai repetează acuma rugăciunea, ca să puneți în toate zilele, înainte de 8 ceasuri dimineața de a se mătura înaintea locuinței dumnea-voastră, și de a vă prevesti, că unde nu va găsi măturat, Poliția va pune oamenii săi de a mătură, pentru care stăpânul casei va fi silit de a plăti o jumătate de sfanțih.'
[206] TNA, FO 78/742, 296r.
[207] BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 105r.

revolution's dying days in September.[208] Fuad Effendi was camped outside the city, and the people were to march on his encampment and demonstrate their loyalty to the Porte. 'Do not bring your weapons,' Brătianu wrote, 'anyone who is armed will be regarded as having criminal intent.'[209]

The revolution in the street was a cultural and emotional experience rather than an intellectual one. It called on the people to be active participants rather than passive spectators, and they seized this opportunity. There were moments of tension, anger, and anxiety, but these were connected to the threat of counterrevolution and invasion, and they seldom lasted long. The most engaged people joined revolutionary clubs and spoke up in debates, but there were plenty of other ways to engage with the revolution. There were the meetings on Liberty Field, the pageants and ceremony that accompanied the visit of Suleiman Pasha and the burning of the Organic Regulations, and there were those small nightly gatherings to listen to the day's news from home and abroad. Uncertainty might have reigned in the palace for much of the summer, but the revolutionary culture thrived in the streets, and its broad popular appeal was demonstrated on the eve of the Ottoman occupation of Bucharest. Some forty thousand people congregated and left the city to meet the Ottoman representative Fuad Effendi and his army at their Cotroceni encampment to the south-west of the capital.[210] The revolutionary leaders had told them they were sovereign, and they believed it, but Fuad was unmoved. His troops entered Bucharest on the morning of 25 September, and a last stand by the city's firemen was soon overwhelmed. 'The city,' wrote Colquhoun,' is almost under martial law…I fear many excesses yet will take place.'[211] The summer of revolution was over, and the popular political culture it had unleashed was suppressed. The people of Bucharest faced the uncertainty of military occupation again.

[208] BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 321. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 192-193.
[209] *Anul 1848,* IV, 316. '…nu poarte nimenia arme; fiind-că acela ce se va dovedi că are arme asupra lui, va fi privit cu drept cuvînt ca un cugetător de ce-vași crimă.'
[210] Fl. Georgescu, 'Anul Revoluționar,' 269; Hory to Aupick, 24 September 1848, CAD 166PO/E/168.
[211] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 26 September 1848, TNA, FO 78/743, 53r-v.

III. Control Beyond the Capital

The revolution could not live by Bucharest alone. Wallachia's capital was home to some sixty thousand people, but the population of the principality as a whole stood at around two million.[1] If the revolutionaries hoped to enact lasting change, then they needed to win broad popular support. Few historians would now agree with Lewis Namier's description of the events of 1848 as a 'revolution of the intellectuals', but most accounts of the revolutions across Europe still prioritise urban centres.[2] Mike Rapport begins his general history with 'crowds of working-class radicals and middle-class liberals in Paris, Milan, Venice, Naples, Palermo, Vienna, Prague, Budapest, Kraków and Berlin.'[3] Articles have been written on 'The European Capital Cities in the Revolution of 1848' and 'The Revolution as Urban Event', while whole books have been devoted to the students and revolutionary clubs of Paris.[4] Rural communities have received less attention, and peasants have often been treated as either opponents or passive recipients of the revolution, rather than active participants.[5] Historians have preferred barricades to barns, but the bulk of the European population in 1848 consisted of peasants living in rural communities, and revolutionaries ignored them at their peril.[6] Paul Ginsborg described the failure of 'predominantly urban, middle-class revolutionary governments to secure the support of the peasant masses' as 'one of the central problems' for historians of 1848. 'Peasants from every part of Europe,' he wrote, 'made up the armies of Windischgrätz, Radetzky, Haynau and Paskievitsch which crushed Prague, Milan, Vienna, Budapest and ultimately Venice…The European peasantry, by its

---

[1] Bucharest's population increased from 50,370 in 1835 to 64,860 in 1853. The population of the principality as a whole rose from 1,920,591 in 1831 to 2,400,000 in 1960. See Hitchins, *The Romanians,* 173-175.
[2] Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of the Intellectuals,* (London: Oxford University Press, 1946).
[3] Rapport, *Year of Revolution*, ix.
[4] Rüdiger, Hachtmann, 'The European Capital Cities in the Revolution of 1848', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds, trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 341-370 and John Breuilly and Iorwerth Prothero, 'The Revolution as Urban Event: Hamburg and Lyon during the Revolutions of 1848-49', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds, trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 371-400; John G. Gallaher, *The Students of Paris and the Revolution of 1848*, (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980); Peter H. Amann, *Revolution and Mass Democracy: The Paris Club of 1848*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975).
[5] Peter McPhee makes the point about peasants being 'acted upon' in the introduction to Peter McPhee, *The Politics of Rural Life: Political Mobilization in the French Countryside 1846-1852*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 9-11. It can be seen in the Wallachian context in accounts of the propagandists sent out into the countryside by the Provisional Government. See. for example, Apostol Stan, 'Propaganda revoluționară la sate în revoluția de la 1848 din Țara Românească', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 769-791.
[6] On the barricades, see Jill Harsin, *Barricades: The War of the Streets in Revolutionary Paris, 1830-1848,* (New York: Palgrave, 2002) and Mark Traugott, *The Insurgent Barricade,* ((Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010).

indifference or open hostility to the revolutionaries, sounded their death knell.'[7] Claus Møller Jørgensen suggested the problem was one of 'connectivities'. He argued that the connections between cities were stronger than those between urban centres and their rural hinterlands. It was easier for revolution to travel from Paris to Bucharest than it was from Bucharest into the surrounding plains because the political, cultural, and technological connections already existed.[8]

Jørgensen's thesis ignores the formal and informal networks that linked city and countryside. He makes no mention of markets in his article, and neither priests nor churches appear either. The French revolutionaries of 1789 had built their rural propagandistic efforts on the model of Catholic instruction that had developed over the preceding two centuries to purge pagan beliefs and practices from the French countryside, and their successors in 1848 adopted similar approaches.[9] Priests in the Veneto blessed the flags of the civic guards, and the bishop of Padua, Modesto Farina, urged his parish clergy to 'teach the people their duty to defend by force of arms, in the best way possible, the independence we have obtained.'[10] In France, Alexandre Ledru-Rollin appointed republican *commissaires* and *sous-commissaires* to replace Orléanist prefects and sub-prefects, and the *démoc-socs* employed rural pedlars *(colporteurs)* to spread propaganda.[11] The Hungarian leader Lajos Kossuth travelled from village to village during the autumn of 1848 and urged the peasants to resist Habsburg invasion. His speeches, according to Jonathan Sperber, were 'examples of a new form of political mass mobilization' that was 'unusual in eastern Europe during the mid-century revolution.'[12] But large gatherings of Romanian-speaking peasants took place at Blaj in Transylvania in May and September, and the first of these served as a model for the meeting at Islaz in Wallachia in June.[13]

The revolutions of 1848 marked the beginnings of a new national politics across the continent. Romanian historians have tended to frame events in Wallachia, Moldavia, and

---

[7] Paul Ginsborg, 'Peasants and Revolutionaries in Venice and the Veneto, 1848', *The Historical Journal* XVII (1974), 503-550.
[8] Jørgensen, 'Transurban interconnectivities'.
[9] David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 161-165.
[10] Paul Ginsborg, *Daniele Manin and the Venetian Republic of 1848-1849,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 165.
[11] McPhee, *The Politics of Rural Life,* 79; Edward Berenson, 'Organization and "Modernization" in the Revolutions of 1848', in in Dieter Dowe et al. eds., trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 559-582, 571.
[12] Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 166.
[13] Stan, *Revoluția română,* 102-105. Sperber himself discusses the first meeting at Blaj some twenty pages before he describes Kossuth's meetings as 'unusual'. See Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 144-146. For an account of Romanian activity in Transylvania, see Keith Hitchins, *Orthodoxy and Nationality: Andreiu Șaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania, 1846-1873*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977).

Transylvania in the context of national unification and the formation of the modern Romanian state, but it would be better to consider national politics in 1848 as a question of the expansion of the political sphere.[14] Annabel Brett has written persuasively about the 'metaphysical boundaries of the city', by which she means the state or commonwealth, and the 'ontological ground on which its structure of laws and rights is erected' in early modern natural law.[15] Those metaphysical boundaries were expanding during the mid-nineteenth century. The state had once meant the ruler, but now it meant a territory and people. In 1846, the Hungarian ethnographer and statistician Elek Fényes described the essential features of the Hungarian consciousness, and among them he listed 'state-making' abilities.[16]

National politics in 1848 meant democratic politics. Wallachia might have lacked France's internal trade networks that saw *colporteurs* traversing the countryside, but government-employed propagandists played an important role in bringing word of the revolution and the new constitution to towns and villages across the principality. They were supported by priests, schoolteachers, and local officials. Elections were planned, and regional governors were replaced with new revolutionary administrators. These men were to extirpate counterrevolutionary sentiment within local government and lay the groundwork for the new order. The revolution was to redefine the relationship between centre and periphery and connect local and national politics. It was not just a new form of political mass mobilisation. Sperber's formula implies a population that was acted upon rather than acting for itself, but all across Europe people were discovering ways to articulate their local and particular political grievances within a national framework. Those who appealed to those grievances profited. The election of the French socialist Raspail in a by-election in September was followed by the nailing of a placard to the tree of liberty in Cogny in Rhône. 'Tremble, ye aristocrats of Cogny,' it read. 'Raspail is one of those elected. If certain blasphemers—those who did not vote for him—merit punishment, woe unto you, ye rich men of Cogny.' But nobody in France profited more from rural grievances than Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte. In his manifesto for the elections of December 1848, he positioned himself as the voice of the people: 'Our poverty is growing worse every day,' he declared. 'The unfortunate die of hunger. The worker has no employment. The peasant has no market for his crops.' His victory was

[14] See, for instance, Bodea, *Lupta românilor;* Berindei, *Revoluția Română;* Stan, *Revoluția română;* Iscru, *Revoluția română.*
[15] Annabel Brett, *Changes of State: Nature and the Limits of the City in Early Modern Natural Law,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), 7.
[16] Quoted in Holly Case, *Between States: The Transylvanian Question and the European Idea during World War II,* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009), 13-14.

celebrated in the commune of Badonviller in the Vosges with bonfires and shouts of 'Long live Napoléon! Down with the rich! String the aristocrats up! Long live the guillotine!'[17]

But peasant political engagement in 1848 went beyond the anger and violence of old-style jacqueries. The debates of the Wallachian Property Commission of August revealed a peasantry that could articulate its grievances in the language of the new revolutionary order. They invoked the constitution, cited the oath to uphold it that all participants had sworn, and spoke of the Wallachian nation. Deputy Iordache Buga of Buzău County connected the constitution's promise of land with the inheritance of Adam at the commission's third meeting, and at its eighth-and-final session he told the other deputies that the peasants would meet 'any request of our mother country… because this is right and brotherly.'[18] The two words he had chosen—*dreptate* and *frăție*—appeared at the top of every government document and were emblazoned across the Wallachian tricolour.

The peasants of 1848 would not sit and listen quietly. They were active political agents on the national stage, and when it seemed that their grievances might be sidelined they took matters into their own hands and practised the old tactics of passive resistance and sabotage. Before 1848 they had filed petitions and burned wheat and hay in the fields.[19] During the revolutionary summer they fished in the ponds of their landlords, took wood from the forests, and grazed their animals on the manorial reserve. None of these tactics was exclusive to Wallachia. Peasants across the continent practised wood theft.[20] Prussian peasants exercised passive resistance and sabotage, and Hungarian ones lodged petitions and turned to the courts to redress their grievances.[21] It was the scale of these activities that differentiated 1848 from earlier years. Disputes had been localised and specific before the revolution; during the summer they became matters of national significance.

Peasant revolutionary activity reflected the hardship they had endured over the preceding decades. The Wallachian peasant received little formal education. He didn't relax

---

[17] See McPhee, *The Politics of Rural Life,* 106-137.

[18] *Anul 1848,* III, 368 & 518. 'la ori-ce cerere a mumei noastre patrii, sîntem în picioare; că aceasta este dreptate și frăție.'

[19] For discussions of the agricultural order in the first half of the nineteenth century, see Marcel Emerit, *Les Paysans Roumains depuis le traité d'Adrinople jusqu'à la liberation des terres (1829-1864),* (Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1937), 1-295 and Ilie Corfus, *Agricultura Țării Românești*.

[20] See, for instance, Josef Mooser, 'Property and Wood Theft: Agrarian Capitalism and Social Conflict in Rural Society, 1800-1850. A Westphalian Case Study' in Robert G. Moeller ed., *Peasants and Lords in Modern Germany: Recent Studies in Agricultural History,* (London: Routledge, 1986), 52-80.

[21] For Prussia, see Robert M. Berdahl, *The Politics of the Prussian Nobility,* 264-310 and William W. Hagen, *Ordinary Prussians: Brandenburg Junkers and villagers, 1500-1840*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). On Hungary see Robert W. Gray, 'Bringing the Law Back In: Law and the Hungarian Peasantry before 1848', *The Slavonic and East European Review,* 91 (2013), 511-534 and Robert William Benjamin Gray, *Land Reform and the Hungarian Peasantry c. 1700-1848,* (PhD Thesis, University College London, 2009). [http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/19321/1/19321.pdf accessed 14 April 2019].

under a tree and read the constitutional reforms of the day or the works of Frederick the Great, as the Moldavian writer Mihail Kogălniceanu improbably claimed the French and Prussian peasantry did.[22] Few were literate. Of the 1,400 men recruited to the Wallachian militia in 1834, only 120 could read.[23] Access to education improved during the 1830s and 1840s with the introduction of new village schools, but enrolment was poor due to the cost of books and a general lack of enthusiasm for education, especially in areas with little history of schooling. Those children who did attend often shared classrooms with other students of dramatically different ages. In some cases children as young as five or six were taught alongside seventeen- and eighteen-year-olds. The education they received was religious and practical. Textbooks covered scripture and agricultural practices.[24] Their ancestors had been liberated from serfdom by Constantin Mavrocordat in 1746, but personal freedom had not brought economic independence. Two categories of peasants existed after Mavrocordat's reforms: the *moșneni,* or free peasants, and the *clăcași,* who were obliged to perform labour services in exchange for access to land. Both groups were subject to state taxation, and the heavy burden this imposed forced many free peasants to sell their land and become *clăcași* to keep up with payments.[25] In his *Account of the Principalities,* the former British consul at Bucharest William Wilkinson wrote that 'there does not perhaps exist a people labouring under a greater degree of oppression from the effect of despotic power, and more heavily burthened with imposition and taxes, than the peasantry of Wallachia and Moldavia.'[26]

The introduction of the Organic Regulations in 1831 did little to improve peasant life. Pavel Kiselev's reform programme promised much but delivered little. It guaranteed every peasant a portion of land for his home and garden and a second parcel to grow crops and graze livestock.[27] If a landlord's estate was too small to provide each peasant with the requisite plot then those who missed out had the right to move to another one. But the Organic Regulations were poorly written and often subject to abuse. Landlords used different lengths of sticks when measuring out peasant plots from the ones they used to describe their own, and Prince Gheorghe Bibescu placed new restrictions on movement: just two peasants

---

[22] Kogălniceanu, 'Cuvînt pentru Deschiderea Cursului de Istorie,' in Cornea, *Propășirea,* 614-615.
[23] Drace-Francis, *Modern Romanian Culture*, 41.
[24] These schools were modelled on the educational method of the English reformer John Lancaster. The Bible Society Agent Benjamin Barker was impressed by the school at Giurgiu when he visited in 1834. See E.D. Tappe, 'Bible Society Agent', 389. For a general discussion of village schooling, see Nicoleta Roman, 'Școlile sătești din Țara Românească' in Mihalache, *Educația publică.*
[25] For a discussion of the free peasants, see Hitchins, *Romanians,* 63-65.
[26] Wilkinson, *Account of the Principalities,* 155.
[27] The size of the second parcel was determined by the number of draught animals that he owned and thus how useful he was to his landlord. See Corfus, *Agricultura Țării Românești,* 77-107 and Emerit, *Les Paysans Roumains,* 80-84.

per village per year were allowed to move estates. In 1843, only 288 people were granted permission.[28] Landlords enjoyed monopolies on the sale of various goods on their estates, including meat and alcohol, and the labour obligations imposed on the *clăcași* were more burdensome than they had been before 1831. Karl Marx compared the peasant's lot with that of slaves in the American South. The Organic Regulations stipulated a base of twelve days of *corvée,* but additional obligations meant that in practice it amounted to thirty-two days, and a day wasn't defined by the calendar. It was determined on the basis of what a landlord considered an average daily output. 'Even a Cyclops,' wrote Marx, 'would be unable to finish the job within 24 hours,' and by these means, 'cried a boyar, drunk with victory, the 12 *corvée* days of the *Règlement Organique*… amount to 365 days in the year.'[29] The peasants themselves were often just as articulate as Marx in expressing their suffering. 'As soon as spring begins and we start sowing our seeds,' complained the inhabitants of an Ilfov estate in 1843, 'the tenant farmers bind us over to go work on their lands, where we labour for days and days… which become whole months.'[30] Another from Zimnicea in Teleorman pleaded that he and his peers had been brought 'to the greatest poverty, such that some of us have only our hands and our souls left,' while the people of Dobriceni in Vâlcea 'barely escaped being extinguished from the face of the earth.'[31]

Years of scarcity, natural disaster, and epizootic disease piled further misfortunes on the peasantry, while landlords and tenant farmers exploited the new commercial opportunities afforded by the abolition of the Ottoman monopoly.[32] Wheat production skyrocketed under the Organic Regulations. It was grown for export rather than the internal market. Most peasants subsisted on maize. The ratio of land sown with maize to land planted with wheat was 7:1 in 1829, but by 1840 the two cereals enjoyed an equal share of land usage.[33] Both crops were subject to natural disaster, and several struck in 1847. Locusts ravaged the fields

---

[28] Corfus, *Agricultura Țării Românești,* 119-121.

[29] Karl Marx, trans. Ben Fowkes, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, (London: Penguin, 2004), volume I, 345-348. Marx's figures came from Élias Regnault's *Histoire politique et sociale des principautés danubiennes* (Paris, 1855). Regnault likely got them from Nicolae Bălcescu, who estimated that peasants spent fifty-six of the 140 usable days of the agricultural calendar working their landlords' estates. For a discussion of Bălcescu's calculations see Sultana Sută-Selejan, *Gîndirea economică a lui Nicolae Bălcescu*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1967), 276-277.

[30] Many landowners leased their estates to tenant farmers as this provided a guaranteed income rather than the uncertainty of the harvest. Peasant complaint quoted in Apostol Stan, 'Arendășia în Țara Românească în epoca regulamentară (1831-1848) Aspecte social-economice', *Studii*, 20 (1967), 1177-1197, 1179. 'îndată ce începe primăvara și semănăm și noi bucate pe pământ, numitu arendaș ne silește de mergem la ale sale bucate, unde muncim zile întregi și multe…care sînt luni întregi.'

[31] Stan, 'Arendășia', 1194-1196. '…ne-a adus la cea mai mare sărăcie, încît unii din noi am rămas numai cu mîinile și cu sufletul…' '…ne-a luat și vitele ce am avut, de abia am scăpat și așa ne-a stins din fața pământului, lăsîndu-ne săraci cu lacrimi pe obraz…'

[32] For a discussion of the rise of tenant farmers, see Giurescu, *Originilor și dezvoltării burgheziei*, 160-188.

[33] Hitchins, *Romanians*, 180.

and poor rainfall left the wheat crops in some districts 'lost beyond hope'.[34] The second epizootic outbreak of the decade in August and September did still greater damage. 'The poor peasantry,' wrote the British consul R.G. Colquhoun, 'are much to be pitied: in most instances they had borrowed money to replace their losses, & now they see their new purchases swept off by the same disease.'[35] Tallow was scarce and the linseed crop failed, but there were signs at Bucharest in the autumn and winter of 1847 that the maize harvest for that year would meet demand. The price per kilo fell from between 72 and 75 piastres in the first week of September to between 58 and 61 piastres by the end of December.[36] The subsistence crisis was easing, but peasants remained the most economically vulnerable in society, and their problems were exacerbated by the obligation to pay tithes, which landowners often exploited.[37] The most common abuse was to collect the tithe after the peasants had finished threshing their crops and take only the grain, not the sheaves. A landowner in Islaz waited until the beginning of September to collect tithes in 1845, and the experience was likely still fresh in the memory of many of the peasants who gathered outside the village on 21 June 1848 to hear what the revolutionaries had to say.[38]

Reshaping the Provincial Order

Prince Bibescu resigned four days after the meeting at Islaz, and the new Provisional Government began stamping its authority on the country. It needed to embed the revolution in local political structures. The first priority was to replace the functionaries of the old order with men loyal to the new constitution. Several of the new appointees had close personal connections to the members of the Provisional Government. The new administrator of Brăila, Dimitrie Golescu, was the Minister of Justice's cousin, and the government's choice for Prahova was the painter Ion Negulici.[39] He had studied in Paris with several of the young revolutionary leaders and received financial support from both the Golescu and Brătianu families.[40] Other appointees had local government experience. Scarlat Filipescu kept his post

[34] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 16 June 1847. TNA, FO 78/697, 68v.
[35] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 14 September 1847, TNA, FO 78/697, 91v.
[36] TNA, FO 78/697, 121r.
[37] On tithes, see Corfus, *Agricultura Țării Românești,* 96-102.
[38] Emerit, *Les Paysans Roumains,* 275.
[39] *Anul 1848,* I, 555.
[40] For a biographical sketch of Negulici, see Ion Frunzetti, *Pictori Revoluționari de la 1848,* (București: Editura Meridiane, 1988), 5-25. Alecsandru C. Golescu (the white) makes reference to giving Negulici 50 ducats to help support one of his new enterprises in a letter to Ștefan Golescu that dates from December 1840. See George

in Slam-Râmnic, and when the new administrator of Muscel, Dimitrie Jianu, arrived at his office he found the county secretary packing his bags. He had just been named administrator of Dâmbovița County.[41] Not every appointment panned out as the new government hoped. Several were short-lived. Iancu Crețeanu was named administrator of Ilfov on 26 June, but less than two weeks later the former schoolteacher Florian Aaron was confirmed to the post.[42] The reason for this change is unclear. Crețeanu may have been unwell or had personal reasons to decline the appointment. He wasn't an opponent of the new revolutionary government, unlike another man who benefitted from its patronage.[43] Dimitrie Filișanu was named administrator of Dolj on the same day that Crețeanu was given office in Ilfov, but on 7 August General Gheorghe Magheru wrote to Christian Tell, one of the three members of the Princely Lieutenancy, advising him to replace Filișanu immediately. Magheru described him as 'a man who leans strongly towards the aristocrats.'[44] Filișanu had refused to participate in the oath to the constitution sworn by the citizens of Craiova; he had been lax in recruiting gendarmes for Magheru's forces in Oltenia; and he had refused to replace incumbent sub-administrators with revolutionary supporters. A week later the government transferred Florian Aaron from Ilfov to Dolj.

Aaron had misgivings about his new post, and his concerns reflect the difficulty the government faced in revolutionising local administrations. In a letter of 27 August he informed Magheru that he had no idea why he was being sent to Craiova. He had no personal connection to his new district. Its capital was in torpor when he arrived. All of the local officials were leftovers from the old regime, and only the revolutionary club 'breathed a little of the air of liberty.'[45] Every administrative functionary would need to be replaced, but his lack of personal connections made it difficult to know who to trust. He turned to the revolutionary club for advice. There were 'ups and downs,' he reported, but 'advised by the

---

Fotino, *Din vremea renașterii naționale a Țării Românești, Boierii Golești*, (Bucharest: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului Imprimeria Națională, 1939), 4 vols, vol II, 122-129.

[41] BAR, Mss Rom 3857, 12.

[42] *Anul 1848,* I, 559; BAR, Mss Rom 3857, 30 & 39. For Florian Aaron's political philosophy during the revolution, see Florea Stănculescu, 'Idei social-politice în gîndirea și activitatea lui Aron Florian', *Revista de Istorie*, 28 (1975), 1171-1182.

[43] Crețeanu signed a letter in support of Mărgărit Moșoiu, the new Bucharest Police Chief, on 28 June and he was arrested and held at Plumbuita Monastery by the occupying forces after the revolution. See *Anul 1848,* I, 623 & V, 264.

[44] *Anul 1848,* I, 561; his name also appears at BAR, Mss Rom 3857, 30 & 39; BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 45r. 'este un bărbat ce mai mult se apleacă la partea aristocraților.'

[45] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 85r. 'Numai clubul resufla puțintei aer de libertate.'; for discussions of the revolution in two urban contexts and the work and membership of two revolutionary clubs, see Ileana Petrescu, 'Între revoluția de la 1821 și revoluția de la 1848', in Georgescu, Titu et al. eds., *Istoria Craiovei,* (Craiova: Scrisul Românesc, 1977), 42-56 and Petre Popa, et al., *Istoria Municipiului Pitești*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1988), 129-136.

best men in the city' he soon filled the police force and local district offices with men who were 'completely devoted to the cause.' Soon, he hoped, 'Dolj will be first in all Wallachia' in its revolutionary support.[46] Aaron hadn't needed to build a new network from scratch. He exploited ones that already existed. If a new administrator didn't know of a suitable candidate for a post, then he could ask somebody who might. It was a simple and effective way to form the bonds that Jørgensen argued were lacking between the cities and their hinterlands in 1848.

Local government provided a framework for the revolution to flourish, and the Provisional Government urged its new administrators to weed out weak links in their networks. An address of 28 July complained that 'in many counties there are still functionaries of the fallen government, who have proven themselves to be opponents of the new institutions… and who continue to take actions against the new government's measures.'[47] The Interior Minister called upon the administrators to remove these men without delay. Sub-administrators, police chiefs, and magistrates needed to be 'men who would sacrifice everything for the principles of the new constitution.'[48] The message was reiterated later in the summer. An 18 August circular advised administrators how they could aid the revolution and see liberty take root in the hearts of the people. The first point on the programme was to ensure that 'all sub-administrators are revolutionaries and well-known people.'[49] It wasn't sufficient for them to be revolutionaries alone. They had to be men whose names carried weight, men who could offer local legitimacy. Several administrators took zealously to the task. Six untrustworthy sub-administrators were removed from office in Râmnicu-Sărat in eastern Wallachia and replaced with men who were 'active, honest' and in whom the administrator could have 'total confidence.'[50] When he found two sub-administrators failing to fulfil their duties, the administrator of Gorj, Christodor

---

[46] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 85r. 'În sfârșit, după vreo câteva răsturnări și schimbări grabnice, ajutat de sfătuirile oamenilor celor buni, am provizionat atât poliția cât și districtul cu oameni închinați cu totul causei. Nădăjduesc că peste puțin Craiova nu va fi înnapoia Bucureștilor, și districtul Dolj va fi cea din tâiu din România.'
[47] BAR, Mss Rom 3879, 146. 'pe la quelle mai multe județe înca stau neschimbați unii din foncționarii orînduiți de căzutul guvern quarii au dat dovada qua sunt împotrivitori la nuele instituții alle nației și quari înca și acum urméza a fi împedecători mesurilor que a luat și ea pe tótă ziua Guvernul…' A version of this proclamation as reproduced in *Anul 1848*, II, 533. Instead of 'împedecători' it gives 'împrotivitori'. This likely reflects a change between the handwritten original at BAR, Mss Rom 3879, and the published version, from which the document in *Anul 1848* was likely taken.
[48] BAR, Mss Rom 3879, 146. '…să pue în lucrare rînduirea altor fonctionari, în locul aquellara, în tote posturile administrative adică: supt-administratori și poliței assemenea și prezidenți de magistratori: ómeni jertfiți cu totul nuoelor principe alle Constituției.'
[49] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 484v. 'ca toți supt-administratorii să fie revoluționari și oameni bine famați.'
[50] BAR, Mss Rom 3879, 148. '…am găsit a desființa pe supt-administratorii următori, asupra cărora n'am putut avea deplină încredere…și în locul acestora am rânduit pe D-lor….cari toți sînt oameni activi, onesti și am toată încrederea în D-lor.'

Marghiloman, replaced them with men whom he knew well and trusted.[51] Emanuil Costandinescu of Teleorman County named new sub-administrators for three of his district—Mârgini, Teleorman, and Târgul—and moved the police chief of Alexandria, Iordache Bunescu, to Turnu on the principality's southern border. He hired Petrache Basarabescu to replace him.[52] Both men gave exemplary service to the revolution. The wardens of Alexandria praised Basarabescu for his conduct and his strong relationship with the people of the city, and Bunescu worked tirelessly to recruit for the National guard and prepare the young men of Turnu for whatever would happen.[53] His efforts earned him a stay at Văcărești Monastery after the revolution's end.[54]

Some opponents of the revolution remained in office and undermined the revolutionary cause. Dimitrie Filișanu was not the only man to protect the agents of the old order. Government propagandists in the southern county of Vlașca found that 'the creatures of Vilara', Bibescu's hated Secretary of State, still enjoyed local government favour, and three or four hundred individuals were plotting against the government under the protection of the Giurgiu police.[55] Their account was confirmed by one of the two government inspectors sent by the Princely Lieutenancy to scrutinise local government. His report for Vlașca was damning. There were hardly any National guardsmen and few willing volunteers. Oaths had only been administered in the villages visited by the most active and patriotic propaganda commissars, and the population was ignorant of most of the revolutionary government's measures and scared into submission by landowners and tenant farmers, who warned that the Turks were at their backs. Few local officials were revolutionary supporters. Most were 'the true sons of the old regime.'[56] The Interior Minister related these findings to the local administrator on 13 September. 'Please,' he wrote, 'in the name of the country and the love that you have for it, right these wrongs. You know better than anybody the sad results that may follow if they continue.'[57]

Rigorous oversight was needed to ensure the new order took hold. It came from several sources. Propaganda commissars filed regular reports on their activities and sometimes

---

[51] BAR, Mss Rom 3879, 237.
[52] BAR, Mss Rom, 3879, 156.
[53] *Anul 1848,* III, 457; *Anul 1848,* IV, 242.
[54] *Anul 1848,* V, 545.
[55] BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 123v. '…creaturile lui Vilara se bucură de favoarea Administratorului.' Also reprod in *Anul 1848,* II, 563-6.
[56] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 619v. Also reprod in *Anul 1848,* IV, 148-9. 'fii adevărați ai vechiului regim.'
[57] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 619v. 'Te rog, Domnule, în numele Patriei și al amorului ce ai pentru dânsa, îndreptează aceste neorândueli, căci d-ta știi mai bine decît ori-cine ce triste resultate poate avé a lor continuare.'

commented on the state of local government, as the three propagandists of Vlașca had done in July. A commissar of Romanați County informed the Interior Minister on 16 August that the local tribunal had neither president nor procurator, and that both positions had been vacant for some time. His investigations drew the ire of one Nicolae Chintescu, a member of the tribunal whom Manega described as 'full of aristocracy and despotism,' and who 'slanders and ceaselessly calumnies the new constitution.'[58] But propagandists provided just one level of oversight. Gheorghe Magheru scrutinised local officials in the five counties of Oltenia,. He wrote Christian Tell on 21 August to complain that several reactionaries still held their posts. The four members of the judicial tribunal in Romanați were opponents of the new constitution. He recommended the removal of a judge and a procurator in Olt, a court registrar in Vâlcea, and a quarantine scribe in Mehedinți.[59] No office was too humble to evade scrutiny. The men he suggested to replace these officials were all experienced in government. He put forward Constantin C. Otetelișanu to fill the position of procurator for the court of appeals in Dolj, which was a position that Otetelișanu had occupied in neighbouring Gorj before his family relocated to Craiova. The rest of Wallachia was visited by two government inspectors.[60] Their names were Crețulescu and Duilie, and their reports often guided the Interior Minister's decisions.[61] Crețulescu found several sub-administrators in Dâmbovița County who were incapable of exercising their offices. He reported that many of the county's propagandists spent most of their time in the city and seldom visited the villages, and he noted that a number of local officials, including the president of the municipality, opposed the National guard. The Interior Minister passed this information to the local administrator and instructed him to rectify every defect immediately.[62]

Hostile local officials posed a serious threat to the revolution's future. Plans for nationwide elections were announced on 26 July, and these left local administrators anxious.[63] The first round of voting was scheduled for 21 August with the second to follow at the end of the month. Administrators were requested to provide lists of those 'true

---

[58] *Anul 1848,* III, 231-232. '…când tot de odată m'am văzut din partea d-lui Nicolae Chintescu unul din membrii carele se zice că ar ține locul de President, cu cea mai mare furie despotică atacându-mă și poruncind dorobanților a mă da afară. Această persoană, plin de aristocrație și despotism, în mai multe rînduri a bârfit și neîncetat bârfesce în protiva nouălor Constituții…'

[59] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 7-12. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 295-303.

[60] They were appointed on 18 August. See *Anul 1848,* III, 262.

[61] Duilie went into exile after the revolution. Ion Ghica names him among 28 young Wallachian refugees arriving by boat in the Ottoman Empire. See Ion Ghica, *Amintiri din Pribegia după 1848. Noue Scrisori către V. Alecsandri,* (Bucharest: Editura Librăriei Socec & Comp, 1889), 192.

[62] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 621. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 149-150.

[63] For the electoral system, see BAR, Mss Rom 3832, 349-350 & BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 214-215. Also reprod in *Anul 1848,* II, 495-500 & 599-603.

Wallachians with the required merits to be deputies of Constituent Assembly' so that the Interior Minister could 'make them known to all the world.'[64] Several administrators suggested the timeframe was too short and proposed a delay, which the government accepted.[65] Outbreaks of cholera and work in the fields had hampered propaganda efforts.[66] But the greatest threat to these elections came from conservative local figures. Christodor Marghiloman of Gorj County reported on 16 August that the majority of peasants knew only the names of Zamfir Broșteanu, Constandin Roșianu, Șerban Caramanlâu and Alecu Caramanlâu, who were all influential and conservative local functionaries. These men had travelled through the villages and deceived the peasants, and Marghiloman worried what would happen if two or three such men were elected from each of the districts.[67] He recommended they be removed from office, but if that was impracticable then the government should summon the four men to the capital and keep them there through the elections. If they were allowed to continue their activities then the chosen deputies would 'all be in the image of the aristocrats.'[68]

The revolution needed to become a facet of quotidian life to win and maintain popular support. Changes to local government personnel provided a framework, but only a new intellectual and symbolic order could plant the seeds of revolutionary ideology in the minds of the people. Villages couldn't match the political clubs, commercial associations, and trade corporations that dominated revolutionary life in Bucharest. Revolutionary culture in the countyside relied instead upon churches and village schools. Tricolour flags were raised, and thirteen thousand copies of the new constitution were printed between June and September to be sent to every city, town, and village in the principality.[69] Schoolteachers were instructed

[64] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 484v. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 252. 'Să faci cunoscut cari sînt aceia ce sînt adevărați Români și cu meritele cerute a fi deputați la constituanta Adunare, ca și eu prin publicație să-I fac cunoscut la toată lumea.'; For examples of lists of 'true Wallachians', see BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 274-275, 296, & 297. Some of these lists were drawn up by revolutionary clubs. See, for instance, the case of Mehedinți at BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 281-2.

[65] The first round of voting was pushed back to 31 August and the second to 10 September. BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 244. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 748-749.

[66] BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 238. Also reprod in *Anul 1848,* II, 640; BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 241 & 240. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 638-639 & 595-596.

[67] Marghiloman also expressed these concerns in a letter to Gheroghe Magheru, dated the same day. See BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 70-71. Als reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 235-237.

[68] BAR, Mss Rom 3890, 255v. '…apoi atunci alegerea de deputați va fi compusă tot de imagine aristcratice…'

[69] On the tricolour flag, see Constantin Căzănișteanu, 'În legătură cu drapelele instituite în timpul revoluției muntene de la 1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, IV (1966), 265-272 and Maria Dogaru, 'Tricolorul și cocardele în contextual luptei revoluționarilor pașoptiști', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 861-869; For reports of flags being raised, see also BAR, Mss Rom 3860, 27, 31 & 86; BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 485r; BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 103r.

to read the new constitution to their classes, and all government decrees, publications, and bulletins were to be read at celebrations and outside churches after Sunday services.[70]

Exposure to revolutionary ideology was essential, and the new government launched a vigorous propaganda campaign during summer. Two days after Bibescu's abdication, three to five propaganda commissars were despatched to every county.[71] Their mission was conceived in religious language. Every commissar was 'a priest of the constitution,' and he was instructed to travel from village to village spreading its gospel.[72] He was to be 'an apostle of liberty, and not a demagogue or hellraiser.'[73] He was to speak of brotherhood to the landowners and land to the peasants, inform all of their rights under the new constitution as well as their duties to the country and to their brothers.[74] In every village he visited he was to gather the peasants in church for a ceremony of thanksgiving to God, following which the twenty-one articles of the new constitution would be read and explained. The printing house of Rosetti and Winterhalder published a brochure by one Ioan Pașu to aid in this endeavour, although it's unclear whether it was used or officially sanctioned.[75] It doesn't appear in the Provisional Government's printing bill. It may have been the 'explication of the constitution' that the Interior Minister dispatched to the administrators in early September, but that was more likely an article that appeared in *Popolul Suveran* in early August: 'The Constitution explained in a village school'.[76] Whichever document it was, 120 examples were sent to Ialomița with instructions that the propaganda commissars should read it to the peasants 'in a clear and loud voice'.[77] There were not enough copies for one to be left in each village and so they were to be kept in the larger villages of the county and taken out to the smaller churches to be read on Sundays. The choice of day was practical as well as religiously significant. One of the commissars sent to Brăila County, N. Nenovici, reported in early August that he had visited some sixteen local villages and found them almost deserted. Their inhabitants were out working the fields.[78] 'I did what little I could,' wrote Nenovici, 'and I explained the spirit of

[70] ANIC 601/27/1848, 63; BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 294. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 318-9.
[71] For names, see ANIC 601/28/1848, 63. Each man was paid 500 lei per month for his services. A list can also be found at *Anul 1848,* III, 114-115.
[72] *Anul 1848,* II, 203. 'Comisarul este un preot al Constituției'
[73] Nicolae Isar, *Din istoria generației de la 1848 - Revoluție, exil, destin istoric,* (Bucharest: Editura Universitară, 2006), 32-33. '…fă din trimiși apostolic închinați libertăți, iar nu demagogi și turburători…'
[74] For the propaganda commisssars' instructions, see *Anul 1848,* III, 105-109.
[75] *Anul 1848,* II, 209-219. Pașu was likely the same 'Ioanis Pasho' of Bucharest who signed a petition to the Provisional Government recognising the heroic acts of Toma Gheorghiu in defending the government against the first attempted counterrevolution.
[76] *Anul 1848,* II, 761-771. 'Constituția explicată într'o școală de sat'
[77] ANIC 601/27/1848, 229r. '…poftind pe Dlor comisari orânduiți cu propaganda, a-le citi sătenilor în glas mare și înțelegător.'
[78] Similar problems were reported in Ialomița County. See ANIC 601/27/1848, 149.

the constitution to the priest and a few others, preparing these men to educate their fellow villagers when they return home from work.'[79]

Disease, rumour, and counterrevolutionary intimidation impeded the propagandists' work. The villages of Brăila County that Nenovici visited had seen recent outbreaks of cholera, and a commissar in Buzău County had to interrupt his work for several days owing to the 'piteous state' of Podgoria District.[80] Other propagandists faced popular apathy, which they often attributed to counterrevolutionary misinformation. Andrei Daniil reported that none of the villagers of Tătărești-de-Sus in Teleorman County would join him and the priest in the church for a ceremony in celebration of the new constitution. He suspected that the landowner and tenant farmer of the local estate had scared them into submission, and he asked the government to take measures to rectify the situation.[81] Fear was a powerful weapon for the opponents of the revolution. There were the landowners of Vlașca who reminded their peasants of recent Ottoman invasions, and news of the Provisional Government's flight in July was weaponized in the Prahovan city of Ploiești.[82] Counterrevolutionaries terrified the new enrolees of the National guard with stories of their imminent deaths at the points of Russian bayonets.[83] The struggle was greatest in districts where the local state apparatus offered little support. 'It would take a Cicero to describe the deplorable position of the peasant,' wrote two propagandists of Vlașca in early September.[84] Schoolteachers and priests laboured under 'the most perfect ignorance.' They could read the government circulars, but they didn't understand them, and local secretaries often served two or three villages each. The sub-administrators offered little help. They spoke to the peasants of 'nothing but their duties to the landowners.'[85]

Areas with predominantly foreign populations proved challenging for the propagandists. Giurgiu's population was dominated by foreigners. Many of its functionaries

---

[79] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 402-403. Also reprod in *Anul 1848,* II, 729-730. '…ama făcut tot que-mi a stat prin putință și m-amu întellessu cu preoții și aleșii făcându-I a se pătrunde de spiritul onstitutii, amu preparat adică pe aquea și oameni qua să prepare și ei pe consatenii lor, quând vor veni de la muncă…'

[80] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 541r. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 459. 'Din pricina boalei holeri care până acum a adus plasa Podgoria într'o stare jaluică, și m'a picmit și pe mine, de m'a făcut să'nu întrerup cîteva zile urgentele lucrări…'

[81] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 398r.

[82] BAR, Mss Rom, 3856, 619v. '…arendașii și proprietarii, că zic către țărani, că Turcii sînt la spatele lor și că într-o noapte, aceste trupe vor face invasie inemica…'

[83] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 287r.

[84] BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 118r. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 645. 'Ar trebui un Cicerone ca să nareze, ca să descrie deplorabila poziție a țăranului, iar nu noi, niște mici profesori…'

[85] BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 118r. '…din nenorocire, sătenii aci sunt mai apăsați de cât în ori-ce alt district, după ce că învățătorii de prin sate și preoții sunt în cea mai desăvîrșită ignoranță în cât abia pot citi circularele fără a le înțelege, după ce că logofeții satelor sunt pe câte doă trei sate unul, apoi și subtadministratorii când se duc prin sate, le vorbesc numai de îndatoririle lor către proprietari și nimic alt mai mult.'

were Bulgarian, Serbian, or Greek, and one propagandist complained that they undermined his work. [86] The port of Brăila on the Danube was dominated by foreign merchants. The Italians of the city had celebrated news of revolution in their homeland, but the British vice-consul Charles Cunningham reported that the outbreak of the revolution in Wallachia had produced 'little sensation' in the city and that there was 'no movement or rejoicing of any sort.'[87] Dimitrie Golescu found more support in the city when he filed his report to the Interior Minister on 28 June, but he still considered it a waste of resources to send propagandists to the city. The population included a multitude of Greeks, Turks, Italians, Bulgarians, and Serbs, and he doubted they could possess 'the zeal for the national cause that the times demand.'[88] Central government didn't share Golescu's view of its mission. The national cause didn't exclude foreign-born peoples, and in Ilfov County two men were instructed specifically to travel 'through the Bulgarian villages' and spread the word of the new constitution.[89]

Many propagandists overcame the obstacles they faced, and some found enthusiastic audiences. Two commissars in Argeș County had complained of priests 'hampering' their work, and they reported that reactionaries in Pitești were working to convince the people that 'the sovereign power of the country is the Russian Emperor, and not the people.'[90] This reference to the people as the 'sovereign power of the country' gives an excellent indication of the new and democratic political culture that the revolutionaries were attempting to foster, and the people themselves embraced it. Many of the citizens of Pitești moved ahead of the revolutionary leaders. The local administrator reported as early as 29 June that a group had gathered in the city demanding the immediate removal of all the old judicial and administrative officials and their replacement with new men.[91] 'Today,' proclaimed the two commissars of Argeș, 'the standard of liberty flutters over all the village churches of the district.' They recommended the local sub-administrator Ilie Trifonescu to the Interior Minister as a true patriot. Other districts made do with one flag shared between the villages, but Trifonescu had provided one for each village under his care.[92] The peasants of Nucșoara

---

[86] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 404v.
[87] Raluca Tomi, 'Imigrația italiană în spațiul românesc: Italienii din Brăila (1834-1876) ', *Revista Istorică*, XVIII (2007), 497-517, 508; Charles Cunningham to Lord Palmerston, 29 June 1848, TNA, FO 78/745, 250r.
[88] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 178v. '…nu poate avea pentru causa națională zelul ce se cere la vremile de acum'
[89] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 12. '…prin satele bulgărești…'
[90] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 458r. '…reacționarilor orașani cu care au a face și care precum vedem i-au făcut să crează că puterea suverană a țării este Imperatorul Rus, iar nu popolul care să reprezentează de guvern…Mulți din preoți de pe la sate, pe care i-am făcut cunoscuți administrații, ne-au șicanat în lucrarea noastră și au fost scandal de reacție între consăteni lor învițnduse a nu primi stindardele libertăți…'
[91] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 201.
[92] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 458r. '…astăzi stindardele libertății fâlfâe pe toate bisericile satelor plășii.'

District in Muscel County were delighted with the new constitution and many enrolled in the National guard.[93] A commissar of Ialomița County boasted of his work in Borcea and Balta Districts. He had read out the new constitution and had the people swear oaths upon it, established the National guard, and burned every decree of the old government that he could find.[94] The old order was being eradicated across the country and replaced with a new one. The government inspector Nicolae Crețulescu found much to praise on his visit to Prahova County in September. Peasants across the county believed in the new constitution, and units of the National guard were organised everywhere. His only concern was that some of the peasants were a little impatient. They wanted the revolution to move faster.[95]

Some Wallachians demonstrated their support for the revolution spontaneously. The merchant community in Giurgiu gathered with their wives and children to greet Suleiman Pasha on his arrival in the principality. They informed him that the work of the government was in accordance with the popular will and encouraged him to recognise the new order.[96] Other communities sought to extirpate the remnants of the old order. The citizens of Râmnicu-Sărat apprehended a man named Iancu Mărculescu who had been found spreading reactionary propaganda, and they sent him to Bucharest under the guard of four private citizens.[97] A group of men from Horezu in Vâlcea County pledged themselves to the cause in an address to Gheorghe Magheru on his visit to the town. They told him that they were all willing to die for the new constitution, and they sent their brotherly greetings to the leaders of the national revival.[98] Other men made financial contributions. The employees of the criminal tribunal in Ilfov County raised 292 lei and 24 parales to support the government, and two peasants of Vlașca donated 23 lei and 30 parales to 'help the country.'[99] Their gesture was recorded in *Pruncul Român* to inspire other citizens of Wallachia.

Propaganda efforts didn't just move from the centre out to the peripheries; they brought the peripheries to Bucharest, too. Delegations from across the principality visited the Wallachian capital during the summer. The first were spontaneous. A large deputation from the Prahovan town of Vălenii-de-Munte arrived in Bucharest on 4 July. It processed through

---

[93] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 351.
[94] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 352. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 561-562.
[95] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 542. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 587-588
[96] After a report by General Duhamel to Count Nesselrode, 26 July 1848, reprod. in Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 194-196.
[97] *Anul 1848,* II, 437. 'Cetățenii Râmnicului-Sărat au arestat pe un Iancu Mărculescul, pentru că l-au dovedit făcând propagandă reacționară, trimițându-l la Guvern în paza d-lor Costache Protopopescul, Costache Atanasiul, Gheorghe Ilie și Grigorie Dragoș.'
[98] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 76-77. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 79-80.
[99] *Anul 1848,* IV, 3-4; *Anul 1848,* III, 713-714. 'doi lăcuitori săteni dându-se sub-iscălitului în ajutorul patriei lei 23 par. 30…'

the city and along Podul Mogoșoaiei towards the Provisional Government's palace. At the head of the people was a priest carrying the revolutionary standard, and when they had gathered in the palace's courtyard he delivered an oration expressing the community's gratitude for the new constitution, which they received with 'joyous hearts.' He invoked the Roman ancestry of the people, and said that 'in the name of liberty, equality, and fraternity, we too raise our standard alongside all those of our compatriots, and beneath them we are decided to die for our country, for our constitution, and for all our brother citizens.' He cried 'Long Live the Country! Long Live the Constitution! Long Live the Honourable Provisional Government and the new Ministry! May the God of the people be with our nation and with us all so that we may write ourselves in the book of life of great and free peoples!'[100] The scene must have been reminiscent of the ceremonies at the *Hôtel de Ville* in Paris in March when representatives of the city received delegations of tradesmen and foreign citizens giving thanks for the revolution.[101]

Peasants were welcomed with open arms in Bucharest. Thousands descended upon the city in June. They carried flags and copies of the new constitution and cried 'Justice!' The people of the capital rushed to the gates to meet them. They hugged, they kissed, and together they marched through the streets.[102] Many peasants remained on the outskirts of the city through summer. The British consul reported that some thirty thousand were camped to the west and south of Bucharest on the eve of the Ottoman occupation of the city.[103] Jules Michelet described the women of Bucharest delivering bread to their camps in his *Légendes Démocratiques du Nord.* They were led by Maria Rosetti, whose husband C.A. Rosetti held several government posts and edited one of the two revolutionary newspapers.[104] Many of the peasants were there at the revolutionary government's request. It invited two representatives from each village in the principality to visit the capital with their local priest. Expenses would be paid from the government coffers. The purpose of their visit was spelled out by the Interior Minister in his request for funds: the delegations had 'come to the capital for propaganda.'

---

[100] *Anul 1848,* II, 30. '…în numele libertății, egalității și al fraternității ne închinăm și noi stindardul spre a fi unit cu cele-lalte stindarde ale compatrioților noștri, sub cari sîntem gata a muri pentru patrie, pentru Constituție și pentru tți frații noștri concetățeni cei într'un glas cu noi. Trăiească Patria! Trăiească Constituția! Trăiească onoratul Guvern provisoriu și noul Minister! Iar Dumnezeul popolilor fie cu nația noastră și cu noi toți, ca să ne scrie în cartea vieții popolilor mari și liberi, fie! Fie! Fie!!!'

[101] For reports of these ceremonies and the speeches delivered by the city's representatives, see *Le Constitutionnel,* 21-23 March 1848.

[102] Taken from Florian Aaron's description of the events of 23 June. See Aaron to Bariț, 12/24 June 1848. Reprod in. Pascu, *George Bariț*, I, 68.

[103] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 28 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 57r.

[104] Jules Michelet, *Légendes Démocratiques du Nord,* (Paris: Garnier Frères, Rue des Saints-Pères, 6, 1854), 299.

They could tell all of the glories of the new constitution when they returned to their villages.[105] These were the beginnings of a national political culture.

Rituals gave the people a sense of ownership of the revolution. The government recognised their sovereignty, but it needed to be felt to become real. The revolution couldn't just be a spectacle. It had to be a pageant in which the people played their part. Towns and cities across the principality emulated the capital in late June and early July and staged ceremonies celebrating the new constitution. They took place in Câmpulung, Călărași and Focșani and they happened in Târgu-Jiu, Brăila, and Râmnicu-Vâlcea too.[106] Cities were illuminated with candles, church bells rang, and the national tricolour was raised.[107] Gunboats fired a salute in Brăila, and the citizens of Târgu-Jiu embraced their peasant brothers who had come in from the fields. Upon receiving a report of the events in Râmnicu-Vâlcea, the Interior Minister appended an instruction to his subordinates: 'inform the government and then publish it.'[108] Attendees at these ceremonies were not passive spectators. They were invited to participate and swear oaths to the new constitution. The people of Focșani affirmed that 'the constitution is sacred' and that 'its fruits are great and of the highest importance, not only for every son of the country, but also for every human soul that lives in this land.'[109] Among the signatories was one 'S. Calcagno,' who identified himself as an agent of the British Consulate.[110] This model of participation wasn't restricted to urban communities. Propaganda commissars administered oaths in the villages, too. The names of those who swore them were recorded in lists appended with the village seal, and some lists ran to hundreds of people.[111] It would be a mistake to assume that these peasants didn't understand what they were swearing. A commissar of Romanați reported that one peasant refused to sign up until he had escaped the burden of the *corvée.* The commissar responded that the people all had to join and work together for the common salvation, and the other peasants of the village seemed to agree. The man who refused became 'the object of derision,'

[105] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 14. 'Mai mulți dintre lăcuitori din cei câte doi de la fiecare sat cu preotul lor, veniți în capitală pentru propagandă...' Each received 20 parales per day. See BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 15.
[106] For a description of the ceremony in Câmpulung, see BAR, Mss Rom 3857, 12; for Călărași, see BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 210; for Focșani, see BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 214-222; for Târgu-Jiu, see BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 254; for Brăila, see BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 211; and for Râmnicu-Vâlcea, see BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 245.
[107] Few Wallachian cities had streetlamps, and J.H. Skene reported in 1854 that Craiovan streets were 'lit with tallow candles.' See Skene, *Danubian Principalities,* I, 222.
[108] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 245. 'să se facă cunoscut guvernului și să se publice'
[109] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 215r. 'Precît constituția este sîntă, precît fructele ei sunt mari și de cea mai frumoasă importență, nu numai pentru fie-care fiu al patrii, ci și petru fie-care suflare omenească lăcuitoare în aceasta țară…'
[110] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 215v. 'S. Calcagno, agent de Consulat Britanique'
[111] For examples from Olt County, see BAR, Mss Rom 3858, 91-171; An example from Teleorman can also be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3858, 213-215.

and his peers urged him to sign.[112] Community, then, was just as important in villages as it was in Bucharest in driving revolutionary participation.

Propaganda commissars enlisted peasants to defend the revolution against internal and external threat. Many signed up to the National guard. More than 240 people enrolled in the village of Slobozia in Teleorman County on 10 September.[113] They pledged never to agitate against the interests of the country and to uphold the twenty-one articles of the new constitution. The peasants of neighbouring Hungary were ambivalent about military service, but the same wasn't true of Wallachia.[114] Many men enrolled as pandours and gendarmes, although there were recruiting difficulties in the early days of the revolution. The administrator of Romanați transmitted a note from one of his sub-administrators to the Interior Minister on 10 July. Many people were willing to sign up as gendarmes, but they had lots of questions that he was incapable of answering. He didn't know what uniform they would wear or how they and their horses would be fed.[115] The promise of wages and exemption from the capitation brought many around. Gheorghe Magheru estimated that six thousand men had signed up by the end of August, although many lacked weapons, and the administrator of Mehedinți reported in mid-September that a thousand men had volunteered to serve as pandours in his county alone.[116] A further 4,470 men signed up to be gendarmes across the principality.[117] Many may have been driven more by financial interest than ideological commitment to the cause, but they were still active participants, and the majority remained with Magheru on the Field of Trajan once Bucharest was lost. It was only his decision to disband his forces that prevented thousands from dying for the cause.

The revolution might have been instigated by a small cadre of intellectuals, but they did their best to win popular support and inaugurate a national political culture. Logistical challenges often arose. Cholera proved a particular impediment, and some propaganda commissars struggled to find suitable transport.[118] Questions also remain over how far the peasants understood everything they saw and heard. Several who were brought before the commission investigating revolutionary participants during the Ottoman-Russian occupation claimed to have had no idea what the Organic Regulations were when asked why they had

---

[112] BAR, Mss Rom 3858, 208. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 570-571. 'a devenit obiectul derâderii'
[113] BAR, Mss Rom 3858, 295-296.
[114] Wolfgang Höpken, 'Agrarian Question', 451.
[115] BAR, Mss Rom 3859, 25.
[116] BAR, Mss Rom 3859, 60. Lack of weaponry was a common complaint. See, for instance, the report of the administrator of Romanați at BAR, Mss Rom 3859, 17; BAR, Mss Rom 3859, 74r.
[117] BAR, Mss Rom 3839, 32v-33r
[118] See, for instance, C. Paleologu's report of 11 August at BAR, Mss Rom 5968, 597-598. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 64-66.

participated in their burning.[119] But these same investigations show the breadth of popular support. There were priests from Dolj County, merchants from Mehedinți, lawyers from Buzău, and peasants from all over the country.[120] The youngest were teenagers and the oldest in their fifties. Even the opponents of the revolution acknowledged its broad popular appeal. The Russian General Duhamel estimated that some ninety percent of the Wallachian population sympathised with the revolution by late summer.[121] Many may have been predisposed towards the revolutionary ideals, but their support was won through a sustained and sophisticated campaign. It was more than a simple propaganda mission. It was a coordinated policy that altered the relationship between central and local government and the people. The government was not to be a distant and unresponsive body. It was to be embedded in the will of the people. A Princely Lieutenancy decree of 18 September acknowledged this new role. It recognised public displeasure with the state of the judiciary across the country, and it called upon local officials to consult the people when filling those offices.[122] Foreign policy fell under the same remit. Copies of petitions to the Ottoman Sultan and Russian Tsar were circulated to local administrators with instructions to send them out into the districts to gather as many signatures as possible.[123] Earlier petitions to the Tsar and the Sultan had been signed by only a few people.[124] These were signed by several thousand, and they served the same purpose that Paul Pickering discerned in the Chartist petitions of the 1840s. They represented a 'symbol of the unity between the cause and the people.'[125] Opponents of the revolution attempted to follow the same tack. Costache Stanciovici of Dolj County wrote to Gheorghe Magheru on 4 September informing him that he had heard stories of gatherings of 'many enemies of liberty' at Tatomirești. They were forming a committee and gathering signatures for a petition addressed to Suleiman Pasha.[126] The weight of public opinion had become a matter of political interest.

Government propaganda activities were beginning to founder by early September, but the Wallachian people had already rallied to the cause. The campaign had cost 55,000 lei,

---

[119] See, for instance, the cases of Ion Opaina, Dragomir Datcu, Pârvan Bârcă, Ion Moise, Dumitru Velea, and Dragomir Valea at ANIC 601/6/1849, the case of Marin Vârjianu at ANIC 601/7/1849, and of Nicolae Gălășescu at ANIC 601/10/1849.
[120] ANIC 601/9/1849; ANIC 601/18/1848; ANIC 601/45/1849.
[121] Jianu, *Circle of Friends,* 351.
[122] BAR, Mss Rom 4634, 88.
[123] For examples from Prahova, Romanați, Râmnicu-Sărat, Olt, and Brăila counties, see BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 24-60.
[124] See Vlad Georgescu ed., *Mémoires et projets de réforme dans les principautés Roumaines 1769-1830,* (Bucharest: Assocation internationale d'études du Sud-Est européen, 1970).
[125] Paul Pickering, '"And Your Petitioners &c": Chartist Petitioning in Popular Politics 1838-48,' *English Historical Review* 116 (2001), 368-388.
[126] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 125-126. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 618-619. '…mai mulți inemici ai libertății…'

and on 17 September the Interior Minister wrote to the Princely Lieutenancy recommending that the number of commissars be reduced. His department couldn't afford to pay them anymore.[127] Foreign agents had failed to secure financial support from the Great Powers and banking houses of Europe, and popular donations could only go so far. But the peasants were still camped outside Bucharest and gathered around Magheru on the Field of Trajan in Vâlcea. They were listening, they were speaking, and they were participating. And if there was one article in the new constitution that had most won their favour, then it was article thirteen, which promised them land.

The Land Question

Not all of the revolutionaries supported article thirteen. Robert Colquhoun informed Lord Palmerston on 1 July that 'there had arisen some differences among the members of the Provisional Government, chiefly on the question of the allotment of parcels of ground to each peasant residing on the boiars' estates.'[128] The disagreement reflected a contradiction in the Islaz Proclamation. Article thirteen called for 'the emancipation of the peasantry, who will be made landowners through compensation,' but the proclamation's subheading demanded 'respect for property,' as well as for persons.[129] The revolution was to be for 'the good and the happiness of all classes of society.' The majority would 'lose nothing to the minority, for this is unjust,' but nor would the minority be sacrificed to benefit the majority, for this would be 'a crime against God.'[130] The delicate balance between these two principles would define the revolution for landowners and peasants.

Historians have tended to see the agrarian question as dividing the revolutions of southeastern Europe from their western European contemporaries. Wolfgang Höpken suggested that it gave the revolutions a 'totally different social dimension' from events in France and Germany, but this distinction needs reassessment.[131] Höpken's analysis is emblematic of what Maria Todorova termed 'chronic allochronism'. 'The non-westerner,'

---

[127] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 23 & 28.
[128] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 1 July 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 121r.
[129] TNA, FO 78/742, 160r &162r. 'Respect aux propriétés' 'L'Emancipation des taillables at corvéables qui deviennent, propriétaires au moyen d'une indemnité.'
[130] TNA, FO 78/742, 160r. 'Ce soulèvement se fait pour le bien-être, pour le bonheur de toutes les classes de la société, sans porter préjudice à un seul individu. Il ne fant [sic] pas sacrifier le plus grand nombre au plus petit, car c'est injuste ; mais sacrifier le plus petit nombre au plus grand, est un crime devant Dieu.'
[131] Höpken, 'Agrarian Question', 443.

she writes, 'is always living in another time, even when he is our contemporary.'[132] Peasants across Europe had suffered in the years between the Napoleonic Wars and the outbreak of revolution in the spring of 1848. In Prussia the ranks of landless agricultural labourers expanded at twice the rate of overall population growth during the period. This crisis didn't only reflect growing birth rates. It was also driven by the division of plots of land on the death of a family patriarch, which often left their inheritors with small and unproductive scraps.[133] Many were forced to sell their land like the Wallachian free peasants, and some one hundred thousand of them fell from the landowning classes into the exposed and vulnerable masses of agricultural day labourers.[134] The tightening of the forest code in July Monarchy France in 1846 restricted peasant access to firewood, and harvest failure in 1847 left many peasants and tenant farmers buying back the crops they had pre-sold at much higher prices.[135] An economic crisis gripped Europe on the eve of revolution, and it affected the peasants of Western Europe as much as those of Wallachia.[136]

Agrarian issues should be treated as a subcategory of the social question, which was connected to ideas of popular sovereignty. The similarity would have been obvious to nineteenth-century observers. In his account of the *Ancien Régime,* Alexis de Tocqueville quoted a royal proclamation on the guild system: 'the right to work,' it said, 'is the most sacred of all forms of property.'[137] Access to work was no different from access to land, and few recognised the link between the struggles of the peasants and the urban workers as clearly as Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte. He placed them side-by-side in his manifesto for the election of December 1848: 'the worker has no employment,' and 'the peasant has no market for his crops.'[138] Both were issues of self-sufficiency. Giovanna Proccacci described the right to work as 'the social equivalent of the franchise,' but it was more than that. The two were connected. As Holly Case has argued, the solution to the social question in the nineteenth century lay not only in creating new systems, but in creating 'a new kind of person.'[139] If government were to be founded in popular sovereignty, then this new person needed to be sovereign over him- or herself. 'Every man,' wrote Louis Blanc in his 1848 work *Le Socialisme: Droit au Travail,* 'has

---

[132] Maria Todorova, 'The Trap of Backwardness: Modernity, Temporality, and the Study of Eastern European Nationalism', *Slavic Review* 64.1, (2005), 140-164, 155. Todorova likely took the formulation from Ernst Bloch. See Bloch, 'Nonsynchronism.'
[133] Similar conditions were observed in France in the eighteenth century. See Tocqueville, *AR,* 32.
[134] Rapport, *Year of Revolution,* 32-33.
[135] See McPhee, *The Politics of Rural Life,* 56-74.
[136] See Berger, 'Economic Crises'.
[137] Tocqueville, *AR,* 161.
[138] Quoted in McPhee, *The Politics of Rural Life,* 114.
[139] Proccacci, 'To Survive the Revolution or to Anticipate it?', 510; Case, *Age of Questions*, 82-84.

received from God the right to live,' and if a man had the right to live, then 'he must be entitled to the means of preserving it.'[140] In the industrialised cities of France, where pauperism was a serious problem, the right to work gave the unemployed a stake in the new society that the revolution hoped to forge. Land offered the same to the Wallachian peasant. Pauperism was a far-off problem for the two Danubian Principalities, as Mihail Kogălniceanu had observed in 1845, but the peasants, like the unemployed workers of western Europe, had been left behind by the commercial imperatives of the 1830s and 1840s.[141] The revolution offered a chance of redemption. With his own little parcel of soil, the Wallachian peasant could feed his family and prosper. His self-sufficiency underpinned the wider revolutionary programme. The people could not be sovereign if they could not support themselves.[142] Land offered them self-sufficiency. It would make the peasants masters of their own future, and by making them sovereign over their own persons, it made the people as a body sovereign, too.

The Provisional Government needed to proceed carefully to ensure the revolution's success. Forced expropriation was neither desirable nor possible. It would go against the Islaz Proclamation's promise of compensation and undermine the revolutionaries' claims to universality and respect for property. A Russian or Ottoman invasion would swiftly follow. Instead, the government adopted a conciliatory tone. It addressed the landowners as 'brothers' on 28 June and assured them that 'those who had risen in the name of justice and brotherhood had no intention of oppressing any class of society.'[143] There would be no pillaging of estates. The minority wouldn't be sacrificed for the sake of the majority. All that was asked was that the 'poor peasants, the ploughmen feeders of the cities' who had 'borne all the burdens of the country and who for centuries' had worked to improve the landowners' estates and feed their ancestors should 'have for themselves the right to a little piece of land.'[144] This message was intended for both the landowners and the peasants. It counselled the one not to worry and the other to be patient.

The settlement of the land question was meant to maintain order in the principality. There could be no repeat of events in Galicia in 1846, when the peasants rose, slaughtered

---

[140] Louis Blanc, *Le Socialisme: Droit au Travail. Réponse a M. Thiers, Deuxième Édition,* (Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1848), 78. '…tout homme, en naissant, a reçu de Dieu le droit de vivre…si l'homme a droit à la vie, il faut bien qu'il ait droit au moyen de la conserver. Ce moyen, quel est-il ? Le travail.'

[141] Kogălniceanu, 'Despre Pauperism', 573. See chapter 1 for a discussion.

[142] See chapter one.

[143] *Anul 1848,* I, 619. 'Acei care s'au sculat în numele dreptății și al frăției n'au putut avé cuget să năpăstuească pe nici una din clasele soțietății.'

[144] *Anul 1848,* I, 619-620. 'Poporul Romîn voesce ca săracii săteni, plugarii hrănitori ai orașelor, cari până acum au purtat toate greutățile țării prin munca lor și carii de atâtea veacuri au lucrat moșiile și le-au îmbunătățit și au hrănit pe strămoșii voștri, să aibă și ei drept la o părticică de pământ.'

their landlords, and razed their estates to the ground.[145] Ion Ghica spoke of Galicia in his dealings with the Porte and the French and British ambassadors in Constantinople. He told them that since the introduction of the Organic Regulations the peasants' payments to their landlords had become 'an inexhaustible source of humiliations, complaints, and trials which threaten a complete collapse of society.' Scenes from Galicia, he wrote, 'have been constantly present in the minds of the peasants, who have spoken highly of them over the last two years.'[146] Ghica assured the Great Powers that the government wasn't motivated by socialist or communist principles. It would work within the limits of justice to resolve the land question peaceably and with the consent of all parties. Five thousand copies of the government's proclamation on the matter were printed and distributed to local administrators and propaganda commissars to ensure that everyone received the message.[147]

Landlords resisted the challenge to their property rights, and their response threatened to undermine the revolutionary government's claims of universal support. Some two hundred landowners gathered at the Hotel Momolo on the morning of 1 July to debate article thirteen. It was considered a 'clear violation of the rights of man,' and they unanimously agreed to protest the measure.[148] The Minister of War, General Odobescu, and the head of the pandours, Colonel Solomon, who was himself a wealthy landowner, were both present. All agreed it was unlikely that the government would listen to their complaints, and so instead they turned to force. Odobescu and Solomon marched on the Provisional Government palace with a detachment of soldiers, but their attempt was thwarted by the people of Bucharest, and both men were arrested and tried.[149] The landowners were forced to pursue other approaches. Many chose passive resistance. Some had already fled the capital after an outbreak of cholera in spring. Others now followed suit and returned to their estates or

[145] For a discussion of the peasant uprising in Galicia, see Judson, *The Habsburg Empire,* 157-162.
[146] *Anul 1848,* III, 757. 'Les redevances annuelles des paysans valaques envers les propriétaires étaient devenues depuis dix-huit ans une source inépuisable de vexations, de réclamations et de procès, qui menaçaient constamment la société d'une dissolution complète. Les scènes de la Galicie étaient constamment présentes a l'esprit des paysans. Ils en parlaient hautement depuis deux ans. Il était du devoir du gouvernement actuel de prévenir une catastrophe et de chercher, par tous les moyens possibles, de faire cesser pour l'avenir tout prétexte de mésintelligence entre les deux classes.'
[147] BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 103v; a copy of the proclamation was found in the possession of Ioan Ionescu, a propaganda commissar in Olt County. See ANIC, 601/6/1848, 25.
[148] For accounts of this meeting and the fallout see the British and French consular dispatches. Hory to Aupick, 1 July 1848, CAD, 166PO/E/168; Colquhoun to Palmerston, 1 July 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 121-124; Quote from Rezachevici, 'Memoriile istorice ale colonelului Ion Voinescu I,' 845. '…ce măsuri să ia contra unii violări atît de învederate a dreptului omeniri.'
[149] See chapter 2 for a discussion of this attempted counterrevolution.

crossed into Transylvania to await foreign intervention.[150] The departure of these wealthy residents threatened the city's economic prosperity, and it presented an image problem for the Provisional Government. The government had announced its revolution to Europe as the general will of all the Wallachians. Signs of discord undermined this claim and invited Russian and Ottoman intervention, and so the new government made repeated overtures to the boyars. On 19 July it invited them to return to Bucharest in the name of public security and to prove that they were true Wallachians who bore no ill will towards the interests of their country.[151] Eight thousand copies of the decree were printed, and although some landowners did return to the capital, the frequency with which the government was forced to issue similar proclamations suggests that most ignored the request.[152]

The peasant response to article thirteen threatened the stability of the principality, and it may have expedited the government's attempt to settle the question. Having been promised land, many refused to perform their traditional labour obligations, forcing the government to issue a new proclamation on 18 July pleading with the peasants to be patient.[153] To refuse to work the land would devastate the country. It would lead to famine and hardship, and it would be contrary to the brotherhood of the nation. The government urged them to wait for the opening of the Constituent Assembly, which would resolve the matter once and for all. Three days after issuing this proclamation, the government changed course. It announced the formation of a commission to debate the matter with 'maturity' and to 'discover a brotherly solution through a clear understanding between all interested parties.'[154] The idea was likely borrowed from Louis Blanc's Luxembourg Commission, which was established in Paris in March 1848 to debate social reforms before the French Constituent Assembly opened.[155] Two deputies were to be elected from each county. One would represent the peasants and the other the landowners. Villages were instructed to select a delegate to travel to the county

---

[150] See, for instance, the correspondence of Cleopatra Trubetzkoi with her cousin Dimitrie Ghica at BNR, Fond Brătianu, XXVI/3, 34-36. See also *Anul 1848,* II, 515 for the case of Hristodor Hristopolu, who had fled to Brașov according to the Bucharest Police.
[151] *Anul 1848,* II, 332-334.
[152] BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 104r; Hory to Aupick, 30 July 1848, CAD, 166PO/E/168.
[153] For the text of the proclamation, see *Anul 1848,* II, 314; Five thousand copies were printed. See BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 103v.
[154] *Anul 1848,* II, 359-360. '…va fi desbătut cu maturitate și hotărît de o comisie alcătuită de părțile interesante, ast-fel ca printr'o înțelegere lămurită să se dea acestei cestii grele o soluție frățească.'
[155] Samual Hayat, 'Working-Class Socialism in 1848 in France,' in Douglas Moggach & Gareth Stedman Jones eds, *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 120-139.

capital on 6 August to elect a peasant deputy, and landlords were invited to gather and choose for themselves directly.[156]

But landlord participation was limited by their opposition to the revolution. Only men who had sworn an oath to the new constitution could be chosen as delegates to the Property Commission, and all bar one of the chosen representatives came from the ranks of the lesser boyars. Many had only been ennobled under the Organic Regulations.[157] The deputy from Argeș County, Lahovari, noted at the commission's second meeting that the landowners of neighbouring Vâlcea County had refused to participate, and many of the wealthiest landowners remained abroad, despite the latest overtures of the new Princely Lieutenancy and the Ottoman representative Suleiman Pasha.[158] Both had stressed the good order that reigned in Wallachia and affirmed the importance of respect for property, but few landowners heeded their appeals.[159]

Suleiman Pasha's support for the revolution threatened to undermine the commission's work before it had even begun. He stipulated that the new law on landowner-peasant relations could only be decided by an elected assembly. This plan was in accordance with the Islaz Proclamation, but Suleiman insisted on a restriction to the franchise: only those who could read and write should be eligible to vote. It was a requirement that greatly disadvantaged the peasantry, but according to Colquhoun, the Interior Minister Nicolae Golescu 'gladly accepted… in the hope that it would hold out inducements to the peasantry to accept the means of education which it is the intention of the government to offer to all the districts.'[160] In the meantime the land question would surely be resolved to the benefit of the landowners.

Nicolae Golescu's response to the Pasha's demand reflected both the ideological outlook and the fraught geopolitics of the revolution. His statement might seem similar to François Guizot's answer to those who complained of the property qualifications for voting in July Monarchy France—*'enrichissez-vous,'* or 'get rich'—but Golescu's attitude owed more to the government's commitment to the creation of that new kind of person: the well-informed and sovereign citizen.[161] The Islaz Proclamation didn't just promise the peasants land. Article

[156] The plan was published in the fourth issue of the official government newspaper, *Monitorul Român,* and seven thousand copies were distributed to local administrators with instructions to have them read throughout the country. See BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 103r; ANIC 601/27/1848, 104.
[157] Berindei, *Revoluția Română,* 277.
[158] *Anul 1848,* III, 341.
[159] BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 15, 18, 21 & 22.
[160] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 15 August 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 268v.
[161] Quoted in Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 67.

sixteen guaranteed equal access to education for all Wallachians of both sexes.[162] His concession to Suleiman's wishes stemmed from both the need to gain Ottoman support and a genuine hope that the peasants would embrace education as a means to self-improvement.[163] The revolution created a path to citizenship for the peasantry. The idea wasn't a new one for Europe. It had driven many of the revolutionaries in France in 1789, and the Prussian statesman Karl August von Hardenberg had written of the reorganisation of Prussia into a society of citizens in his September Memorandum in 1807.[164] But the idea had seldom been put into practice before 1848, and it had never been attempted in Wallachia. The settlement of the land question was part of the process.

The government wasn't reluctant to grant the peasants their lands. It had already begun working towards that end by the middle of July. Finance Minister Constantin Filipescu wrote to all the local administrators requesting details of the numbers of families living on every estate in the country.[165] His directive was explicitly connected to the future opening of the Constituent Assembly, when 'the question of the peasants will be debated with great seriousness.'[166] He needed to know how many there were so he could budget for landowner compensation. The government's foreign envoys were working towards this objective, too. A national bank was required to enact land reform, and this bank would require foreign credit. Three hundred million piastres were needed, and A.C. Golescu urged his cousin A.G. Golescu to solicit the money from the Bank of France. 'If you cannot succeed in Paris,' he advised, 'then on your return you must make the same enquiries in Frankfurt, before the Rothschilds, and then at Vienna.'[167]

The Property Commission had been suspended by the time that A.G. Golescu received his cousin's letter, and its debates had exposed the fault lines of the revolution outside Bucharest.[168] They turned on the nature of property and labour. The commission's Vice President, Ion Ionescu de la Brad, delivered a brief lecture on the history of both in the principality. His account rested on the historical research of another revolutionary: Nicolae

---

[162] TNA, FO 78/742, 162.
[163] See chapter 4 for a discussion of the geopolitics of the Wallachian Revolution.
[164] Koselleck, *Futures Past,* 77.
[165] ANIC, 601/27/1848, 70.
[166] ANIC, 601/27/1848, 70r. 'Una de chestiile ce urmează a fi supusă și dezbătută de Adunare mai cu multă seriozitate este chestiea clăcașiilor…'
[167] BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXVIII/1, 1D, 10r-v. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 529-530 'Reste donc à Paris, et tâche d'obtenir ces deux choses qui nous sont de toute nécessité et sans lesquelles notre révolution est manquée… Tu t'adresseras à la Banque de France et au divers banquiers pour voir s'ils acceptent et à quelles conditions ; si tu ne réussis pas à Paris, sur ton retour tu feras les mêmes tentatives à Francfort, auprès de Rotschild, puis à Vienne, etc.'
[168] The final meeting of the Property Commission took place on the same day (30 August) that A.C. Golescu wrote his letter. Its activities were suspended on 31 August. See BAR, Mss Rom 3832, 318.

Bălcescu.[169] Property, he informed the deputies, didn't originate in conquest, like in Asia, but in the colonisation of the land. He spoke approvingly of the legendary reforms of the Spartan Lycurgus and criticised the present state of affairs in Wallachia. The Organic Regulations had 'introduced many abuses,' and the labour of the peasantry had become a form of slavery. A landowner named Lenș objected. The *corvée* was not slavery, he said, but rent. The peasant deputies were outraged. 'What sort of rent is it,' demanded the priest, Neagu, 'when, for example, you, sir, come to me and say bind yourself over and come with me… and instead of paying me what my labour is worth, you give me five lei.' If Neagu accepted, it was only because 'that is all that you will give and I have nowhere to go to demand my rights.'[170]

Landowners spoke of theory while the peasants grounded their arguments in practice. The peasant deputy Lipan described the abuses he and his family had suffered. He had been beaten by gendarmes and forced to work. The *corvée* was only meant to apply to the head of the household, and yet his wife had been dragged into the fields alongside him, leaving their three-month-old baby home alone. 'I do not deny,' replied Lenș, 'that the Organic Regulations were harsh, but we're not talking about that… I say that the principle of *corvée* was in itself rent.'[171] His colleague Lahovari seconded him. 'In the spirit of the constitution,' he said, 'everything that has happened until now is to be forgotten… although it was sometimes unjust, it wasn't illegal.'[172] Neagu accepted their argument to move the debate forward. 'We will forget slavery and all the past wrongs to bring peace,' he said. 'Now is the time for reconciliation, and for the landowners to be generous and give us something. Then we will have peace between us.' The other peasants echoed his conclusion: 'peace between us.'[173]

Neagu's response was a testament to the social penetration of revolutionary ideology, but finding agreement between the two sides proved difficult. Both drew on the language and example of the revolution in making their cases. The government had declared Odobescu's attempted counterrevolution an effort to 'compromise our cause in the eyes of Europe,' and Lahovari used the same rhetoric in his defence of private property at the commission's third

---

[169] See chapter 1.

[170] *Anul 1848,* III, 344. 'Ce fel de chirie este ea, când de pildă, vii d-ta și-mi zici: înjuga-ți boii, și hai cu mine până la cutare sat, de pildă la Domnița, să mă duci acolo? Eu plec, te duc până acolo, și d-ta în loc să-mi plătesci cît face munca mea, îmi dai cinci lei, și eu îi primesc, pentru că atâta vrei să-mi dai; n'am unde să mă duc ca să cer dreptul…'

[171] *Anul 1848,* III, 345. 'Nu-ți am tăgăduit, domnule, că Regulamentul n'a fost aspru; nu e vorba desprea aceasta…de aceea zic și eu că principul clăcii în sineși a fost chiria…'

[172] *Anul 1848,* III, 345. 'Că aceea ce s'a făcut până acum trebue să fie uitat, după duhul proclamației; cu cât mai vîrtos că raporturile între țăran și proprietar, deși au putut fi oare-cum nedrepte, nu sînt ilegale.'

[173] *Anul 1848,* III, 345. '…să uităm dar robia, să uităm toate relele trecute; să venim la pace. Acum este vremea să ne împăcăm, și dd. Proprietari să se milostivească a ne d ace-va, și pacea este între noi.'

sitting.[174] 'The whole of Europe,' he said, 'has turned its attention toward us, and we await its sympathy and help.' It would not be forthcoming, he suggested, when the continent saw that 'our peaceful and common revolution… begins its work with the abolition of the right of property and the breakdown of human society!'[175] He asked where it would end. 'Today,' he said, 'they will take from the landowner (without his consent) a part of his land to give to the peasant… tomorrow, no doubt, they will ask of that same peasant some of his cows to give to those who have none.' He feared that in future 'we will not even own our own arms.'[176] Meanwhile the peasants refused to recognise property as sacred until they had some of their own. They drew upon the constitution, brotherhood, justice, and religion to make their claims. Iordache Buga of Buzău County cited Genesis. 'Ever since Adam,' he said, 'God has meant for us all to feed ourselves with the land.'[177] The constitution had restored that right, and Neagu read out the relevant section. It offered the peasants a little piece of land to feed themselves and maintain their animals, and that is what they demanded. It was in accordance with the principles of justice and brotherhood on which the Islaz Proclamation was founded, and it was in agreement with the Christian Gospel.

Neither side was willing to cede ground, and the commission made little progress over the following sessions. Many landowners stopped attending. Sixteen of seventeen peasant deputies were present at the commission's eighth and final meeting, but only six of the seventeen landlords appeared. Some gave excuses. Lahovari sent his apologies: his children were ill and he needed to return to Râmnicu-Sărat.[178] He had been among the most vocal defenders of the landowners when present. At the fifth meeting he spoke of their sufferings. They were not all wealthy men. The diminution of their estates and family difficulties had left many of his constituents poor. Some, he said, were even worse off than the peasants. He didn't oppose improving the lot of the peasants. It was in the interests of both the state and the general love of mankind to do so, but he argued that it shouldn't be done at the expense of those poor landowners.[179] Only one landowner was willing to concede the peasant's

---

[174] BAR, Doc Ist, DCCCX/144. '…era pus de vrăjmașii țării să facă o răscoală și să compromită causa noastră în ochii Europei…'
[175] *Anul 1848,* III, 363. 'Europa întreagă, domnilor, care astăzi și-a întors căutăturile sale către noi, și de la care așteptăm simpatii și ajutoare, Europea întreagă, vă zic, domnilor, ne-ar privi cu groază și cu ură, când ar afla că pacinica și obștească revoluție ce s'a săvîrșit pe malurile unui rîu ce o interesează a început lucrările sale prin desființarea dreptului proprietății, prin desorganisarea societății omenesci!'
[176] *Anul 1848,* III, 362. '…când astăzi se va lua de la proprietar (fără voia sa) parte din pămîntul său spre a se da săteanului….mâne, fără îndoeală, o să se ceară de la acel însuși sătean parte din vitele sale, spre a se da celui ce nu are… ba încă mă tem că nici pe brațele noastre n'o să mai putem fi stăpâni.'
[177] *Anul 1848,* III, 368. '…că de la moș Adam ne-a făcut Dumnezeu ca să ne hrănim toți pe pământ.'
[178] BAR, Mss Rom 4634, 64r.
[179] *Anul 1848,* III, 438-439.

position: Radu Ceaușescu of Ialomița County. Ceaușescu was a vocal and active supporter of the revolution. He was appointed chief of police in Călărași near the Bulgarian border, and the post-revolutionary authorities suspected him of being involved in spreading revolutionary propaganda. He was found and arrested in mid-October and delivered to Văcărești Monastery in November.[180] At the commission's fourth meeting he stood and addressed the deputies and the audience in the gallery. 'I swore on the 21 articles of the constitution,' he said. 'I swore that I would give you land for your nourishment and for your livestock.' He spoke with remorse. 'You were slaves,' he said, 'more slaves even than the Roma… and I enslaved you, brothers. I beat you. I disrobed you. For thirty-six years you cursed me for it! Forgive me, my brother peasants. Take back what I stole from you.' The public gallery was full, and it erupted in applause. People cried 'Hurrah… God forgives you, brother! We are brothers! We will live in peace! Hurrah! Vivat! Long Live the Constitution!'[181] Ceaușescu's speech was grounded in principle, but there were practical questions to answer, and the commission failed to find an agreement. Questions of how much land each peasant should receive and how much compensation should be given to the landowners went unresolved. Debates grew more and more heated. At the sixth meeting Iordache Buga accused the landowner Sibiceanu of breaking the oath he had sworn upon the constitution, and the landowners protested that the meetings shouldn't continue without the full complement of deputies.[182] Each was a representative of his own county. Every man had his own mandate. None could speak for another's constituents, and so agreement was impossible without all present.

The struggle was not between revolutionary peasants and reactionary landowners, but a contest over the nature of the revolution itself. Compromise was beyond the two parties. Their eight meetings resulted in only the tamest agreement, and the Princely Lieutenancy noted that the debates had 'from day to day grown more tempestuous' when it disbanded the commission on 31 August.[183] It had failed to live up to the spirit of justice and brotherhood,

---

[180] BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 145. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848*, V, 65-66; for references to Ceaușescu as a propagandist and his incarceration in Văcărești see *Anul 1848,* V, 359 & 545.
[181] *Anul 1848,* III, 391. '…Am jurat pe cele 21 articole din Constituție; am jurat să vă dăm pământ pentru hrana voastră și a vitelor voastre…voi erați robi, și mai robi încă decât Țiganii…Și eu v'am robit, fraților, v'am bătut, v'am desbrăcat; de 36 de ani, de când mă blestemați! Ertați-mă! Mă rog, fraților săteni! Luați-vă înapoi ceea ce v'am răpit. Eată-mă vă dau părticica de pământ!/Numerosul public ce umpluse toată sala, în cât acum nu mai încăpea, începu o detunare de aplausuri, de strigări de ura! Iar deputați săteni, în exaltația lor, care de care striga: „Dumnezeu să te erte, frate! Să fim frați! să trăim în pace! Ura! Vivat! Să trăească Constituția!'
[182] *Anul 1848,* III, 465-468.
[183] BAR, Mss Rom 3832, 318r. '…din zi în zi devin mai tempestoase.'

and its work was suspended until further notice. All that could be drawn from its debates was a simple restatement of the principles of the constitution:

> Respect for property; respect for persons; Justice, brotherhood; the common good hurts nobody; to sacrifice the many for the few is unjust; to sacrifice the few for the many is oppressive; the peasant will be a landowner so that he may become a citizen and a defender of the country.[184]

The Property Commission's failure undermined the revolution in the countryside. Robert Colquhoun considered the entire endeavour a mistake. 'In their eagerness to swell their numbers,' he wrote to Lord Palmerston, 'and induce the peasantry to rise en masse, [the revolutionaries] held out to them promises which can never be realised.' The peasants, he believed, 'would have equally warmly embraced the cause if the heavy burdens pressing more immediately on them, such as the *corvées* or forced labour, ubadgio or personal service, claque or head money paid to the proprietor had been abolished.'[185] But Colquhoun's concessions would not have created the new men that the revolution needed. They couldn't turn peasants into citizens and defenders of the country. Peasant support had been won by the promise of land, which offered an end to the years of hardship they had experienced under the Organic Regulations, and as the summer wore on and the land question remained unresolved, that promise became a prompt to unrest.

The Struggle Against Disorder

The Wallachian Revolution was remarkably bloodless. Nobody died during its outbreak in June. The only shots that were fired were the ones directed at Prince Bibescu's carriage on the night of 21 June, and of those just one struck its intended target. It lodged in his epaulette and did no bodily damage. Contemporary accounts and government proclamations celebrated the peacefulness of the revolution. In his letter to George Barițiu describing the events in Bucharest on 23 June, Florian Aaron wrote that the Wallachians had 'shown civilized Europe that they know what they want, they know how to ask for it, and they will

[184] BAR, Mss Rom 3832, 318r-v. 'Respect câtre proprietate; Respect câtre personae; Dreptate, frâție; Foloase generale în paguba nimului; A sâcrifica cei multi pentru cei puțini este nedrept; A sacrifa cei puțini pentru cei mulți este silnic; Săteanul va fi proprietar ca să fie cetătean, ca să fie apărăta patriei'
[185] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 28 August 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 284v-285r.

certainly get it.'[186] Other countries had won their constitutions with blood. The Wallachians hadn't shed a drop, and when the new Provisional Government addressed itself to the Sultan on 9 July, it stressed the universality, spontaneity, and pacificity of the movement that brought it to power.[187] The only deaths that marred this record were those of the seven men who fell during Odobescu and Solomon's attempted coup on 1 July, but the bullets that killed them were fired by opponents of the new government rather than its supporters.

But the lack of deaths didn't mean the revolution was free of disorder. Disturbances were common outside Bucharest. Most coalesced around questions of liberty and property, and they tended to pit the principality's wealthier inhabitants against its poorer ones. There was urban unrest, which was often stoked by opponents of the revolution, and there was rural instability, which was usually caused by active and passive peasant resistance. Both forms of disorder made revolutionary leaders anxious, and central and local government officials struggled to balance the interests and needs of the two sides. Their appeals for order and tranquillity were often ignored.

Fear of popular violence was common across Europe during the revolutions. The slaughter of Polish nobles during the Galician Uprising of 1846 was recent history, and even as far west as France the wealthy felt uneasy. The expansion of the franchise led many to fear bloodshed and anarchy, and these worries were reinforced by the June Days in Paris.[188] In Austrian Transylvania, the Englishman John Paget, who was a partisan of the Hungarian cause, recorded urban anxieties about the threat of hordes of invading peasants. He wrote that people were afraid to travel after dark as peasants 'often came out during the night to rob & might catch us on the road.' Rumours of imminent plunder and assault spread through the Transylvanian capital Kolozsvár. 'The Russians,' wrote Paget, 'will be looked on as saviours, if they save the town from the Wallacks.'[189] Even counterrevolution was preferable to a jacquerie, and the same concerns animated the wealthier inhabitants of the two Danubian Principalities. Many refugees from Galicia had fled south into Moldavia, and their plight greatly affected the boyars.[190] The arrival of similar rumours and stories from Wallachia during the summer of 1848 brought a new outbreak of terror. In a letter to her son Lascăr,

---

[186] Aaron to Bariț, 12/24 June 1848, reprod. in Pascu, *George Bariț*, I, 68-69. 'Ei arătară Europei civilizate că știu ce vor, știu cum să o ceară și era siguri că o vor dobîndi…'
[187] *Anul 1848,* II, 146-147.
[188] See Price, 'The Holy Struggle Against Anarchy'.
[189] Much of the Transylvanian peasantry was Romanian-speaking, and Paget referred to them exclusively as 'Wallacks'. Henry Miller Madden ed., 'The Diary of John Paget, 1849', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 19 (1939-1940), 237-264, 243-244.
[190] See Veniamin Ciobanu, *Relațiile politice româno-polone între 1699 și 1848*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1980), 207-214.

who was in exile for his participation in the Moldavian movement of April 1848, the noblewoman Eufrosina Rosetti wrote of stories of Wallachian peasants killing tenant farmers. 'Too much liberty,' she concluded, 'is more pernicious than despotism.'[191]

The rumours that Rosetti had heard might have been exaggerated, but popular unrest posed a serious problem for the revolutionary government. Disorder didn't affect every rural community, as the frustrated reports of propagandists who found their midweek audiences diminished attest, but the extent of peasant resistance across the summer of 1848 was unprecedented. It spanned the country and affected every county. Many peasants refused to work until they received their promised land, and the government was forced to issue a series of proclamations begging them to return to the fields. It promised on 28 June that within three months they would be landowners, but until then it asked them to comply with their duties to the landowners.[192] The point was framed as a question of the revolution's survival five days later. If the peasants didn't work the land and went traipsing through the cities, then they would bring hardship and famine to the country. The government urged them to 'ignore those who say that this is a revolt and you no longer have to work. These men are swindlers.'[193] Similar proclamations continued to appear throughout the summer. The Princely Lieutenancy reminded the peasants on 14 September that leaving the autumn harvest in the fields would bring 'great damage to the country,' and two days later it offered a new explanation for the delay in settling the land question.[194] Many Wallachian estates had been rented to tenant farmers, and breaking those contracts would result in unending claims for restitution.[195] A final proclamation came two days before the Ottoman invasion of Bucharest. The government stressed that article thirteen was sacred. No power could scrap it, but nor could it be put into practice immediately, and the peasants needed to keep up with their labour obligations until the time was ripe.[196] None of these proclamations ordered the peasants to return to the fields. They were formulated as appeals. To order the peasants would have undermined the new notions of sovereignty and citizenship.

Government pleas for order reflected the ongoing struggle to transform emboldened peasants into good citizens. Historians have tended to attribute changes in peasant

---

[191] Quoted in Stan, *Revoluția română,* 204. 'țăranii din Valahia îi omoară pe arendași…prea multă libertate este mai dăunătoare decît despotismul.'
[192] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCXI/228. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* I, 615-616. 'Până atunci numai, vă poftim a mai împlini datoriile proprietărești…'
[193] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCXI/229. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 17. 'Să nu ascultați de cei ce vă spun că acum este zaveră și nu trebue să șicrați nimic. Acești oameni sunt niște oameni înșelători…'
[194] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 21r. 'Arătuele de tómnă remase jos adducei o mare pagubă țerrei…'
[195] *Anul 1848,* IV, 216-217.
[196] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 27. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 293-294.

comportment to delays in settling the land question, but disturbances were common from the opening days and weeks.[197] The Islaz Proclamation spoke to them of rights, not responsibilities, and article thirteen transformed local grievances into a national question. It led to a 'profound change' in the conduct of the peasantry, and landowners felt the effects.[198] Complaints flooded local government offices after the revolution fell in September. The post-revolutionary governor of Ilfov County recorded that 'many landowners and tenant farmers… have shown themselves with claims for compensation for the losses they suffered at the hands of the villagers, who left the harvest in the fields during the recent events.' Peasants abandoned their labour and refused to satisfy legal obligations, and they als allowed their beasts to run wild in the fields, took firewood from forests and orchards, and fished ponds dry.[199] A few cases spilled over into violence. Dumitru Cernea of Ulmeni in Ilfov County saw his house razed to the ground by local peasants, and an official investigation after the revolution identified more than a hundred participants.[200] The revolutionary government lacked the means to bring order to the countryside by force. Numerous landowner and tenant farmer complaints had reached Bucharest by the end of July. Even the most competent local officials struggled to solve the crisis, and on 26 July the government considered a military solution. It directed the Interior Minister to dispatch soldiers 'to bring obedience to the inhabitants' of the countryside.[201] But the Wallachian military was ill-equipped for this task and faced its own struggles to maintain internal order. Many officers resigned during the summer and others deserted.[202] Most rank-and-file soldiers came from peasant stock and would have been unlikely to turn their rifles upon brothers, fathers, and cousins. Few had the equipment. The Wallachian military was short of weaponry, and government requests to landowners to give up their arms to remedy the situation were often ignored. The administrator of Mehedinți County reported on 25 August that not a single person had come forward for the good of the country.[203] Their reluctance was understandable given the threat

[197] See, for instance, Iordache, *Goleștii*, 97-98; ANIC 601/1/1848, 674.
[198] Berindei, *Revoluția Română,* 283. 'Revoluția produsese neîndoielnic o profundă schimbare în comportamentul țărănimii.'
[199] BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 183. 'Mulți din proprietari și arăndași de moșii din coprinsul acestui județu, sau arătat cu reclamații la cârmuire cerând dăspăgubire de pagubile ce le au pricinuit lăcuitori la bucatele ce să afla pe câmpri în vremea evenimentelor trecute…' Landowner and tenant farmer complaints and claims for restitution will be discussed at greater length in chapter 5.
[200] BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 299-300.
[201] ANIC 601/1/1848, 674. '…să trimița pe la aquelle sate resvrătitóre quăte o comandă de ostași spre a adduce pe locuitori la suppunere.' On the use of the military to quell peasant unrest, see Ilie Corfus, *Agricultura în Țările Române, 1848-1864: Istorie Agrară Comparată,* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1982), 104-109.
[202] See ANIC 601/1/1848, 707-801 for changes of personnel within the military. The subject is discussed in chapter 2.
[203] BAR, Mss Rom 3859, 50. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 418.

the peasants posed to property, but it didn't make the government's task any easier. It would take a well-drilled and armed Ottoman army to quell rural unrest.

Disorder wasn't limited to the countryside. It affected towns and cities, too. A propaganda commissar for Dolj County named Costache Burileanu reported in late July that Craiova was 'very turbulent.'[204] The national guard was too small to keep order, and many people had fled the city. Boyars and merchants were terrified by the actions of one Petrache Romanescu, who was said to be stoking unrest. He had told the city's Roma slaves they were free and invited them to quit their owners' homes. Rumours abounded that Romanescu, the freed slaves, and the young men of the city would break windows and burn down houses. Burileanu was unsure whether these claims were true. Many people in the city spoke ill of Romanescu, but whether the allegations had merit or not, there were certainly those who desired a more radical revolution. Burileanu had found one of their proclamations while wandering the city one evening. It was signed 'N.N.' and it threatened violence against opponents of the new order. 'Don't reckon we're sleeping,' it read. 'No, no, no, we're not sleeping; we're only waiting for the right moment to come, and then not a single stone in your house will remain intact.'[205] Two of its targets were addressed by name: Hagiade and Cupa. They were accused of being 'mongrels' rather than 'pure Wallachians' and advised that it wouldn't just be their houses that would be razed to the ground: 'we'll also tear you yourselves into pieces.'[206] It was likely threats such as these that drove forty-four of the city's boyars to petition the Russian General Duhamel in late August to invade and re-establish tranquillity and order.[207]

Violent rhetoric disturbed the peace in towns and cities across the principality, and the government's response was uneven. It adopted a harder line against counterrevolutionary rumblings than it did against radical voices. The Provisional Government ordered the arrest of the president of the law courts in Gorj County when it learned of his involvement in a plot against the new order.[208] It also moved against one Teodor Popescu of Focșani, who had spread anti-revolutionary propaganda in the surrounding countryside. His arrest was to be effected with 'the greatest secrecy,' and both the Provisional Government and the Princely

[204] BAR, Mss Rom 3879, 150r. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 578. 'Tot orașul Craiova este foarte turburat.'
[205] BAR, Mss Rom 3879, 152v. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 581. '…nu socotiți că dormim nu, nu, nu dormim minutul numai așteptăm, și atunci va fi vai și nu rămâine piatră întreagă în casăle voastre…'
[206] BAR, Mss Rom 3879, 152v. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 581. '…ci pe voi o să va facem bucăți bucățele.'
[207] Varta, *documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 245-247.
[208] *Anul 1848,* II, 566.

Lieutenancy urged the people to 'believe nothing' that such intriguers said.[209] Radical revolutionary propaganda was more tolerated. The fifteen-year-old son of a local government secretary caused a stir in early September in the market town of Rușii-de-Vede in Teleorman County. He beat a drum in the marketplace to draw peoples' attention and then read a handwritten proclamation that he claimed came from the government. An Ottoman army had entered Wallachia, and he asked what justification it had to invade. The Wallachians had committed no crime. Their government was legitimate. He urged the people to arm themselves, their wives, their children, and their nephews, and to prepare to die for the country.[210] The local administrator reported that this speech had brought 'fright and unrest to some of the people of the city,' but the Interior Minister at the time, C.A. Rosetti, saw nothing wrong with the boy's words. He thought the speech 'splendid' and advised the administrator to encourage the young boy. 'I see no word of rebellion,' he wrote, 'which is only a conspiracy against a just ruler.'[211] The young man had inspired love of his country and brotherhood and justice, and Rosetti wished that he had more men like this young orator at his disposal.

The revolutionary programme provided a platform for urban populations to articulate grievances, and disputes sometimes led to disorder. Peasant representatives at the Property Commission weren't the only people to exploit the new order for local political ends. Over a thousand people took to the streets in the port of Brăila on 1 August to protest the city's magistracy and the poor quality of available bread and meat. They congregated outside the house of a revolutionary propagandist, Alecsandru Manu, and called him out onto his balcony. A sample of bread was passed up for his inspection. He assured his audience that he would speak with the local administration and ensure their just requests were answered, but as the people acclaimed him several merchants together with members of the city magistracy and the port's Greek population arrived. They were outraged by the spectacle and demanded that Manu descend from his balcony so that they could lay hands upon him. The people resisted, and the merchants attacked them with sticks. A Greek subject named Șteavidi pulled the national flag from the hands of a protestor and carried it off to his national consulate. The people followed and demanded the arrest of both Șteavidi and the Greek consul's secretary, who was said to have been one of the instigators of the confrontation. The local

[209] *Anul 1848,* II, 338-339. '…să se arestuească îndată și aceasta în cel mai mare secret.'; BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 627. 'Ascultați, fraților; nimiciți toate intrigile, și nu credeți nimic din câte vă spun ori-care particular…'
[210] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 592-593. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 740-743.
[211] *Anul 1848,* IV, 33. 'Proclamația lui este minunată…în acesta proclamație eu nu văd nici un cuvânt de rebelie. Rebelia, domnule, este atunci când cine-va conspiră în potriva unei stăpâniri drepte…'

administrator, Dimitrie Golescu, was forced to call in soldiers to restore order, and they transferred Șteavidi to the barracks for his own safety.[212] The people's decision to address their grievances to a revolutionary propagandist rather than the local administrator revealed the extent to which the new order had taken root in the popular imagination. Subsistence was a matter for the revolutionary cause. It was not only a question of local politics.

Brăila sat at the intersection of local, national, and international political concerns. Golesu's report on the events of 1 August was passed to the country's Foreign Minister with instructions that a mixed commission of foreign agents, merchants, and local officials should investigate the dispute. Consular agents stressed the port's neutrality. The Sardinian consul at Galați wrote to the Wallachian Foreign Minister on 4 August to accuse the government's propagandists of bringing unrest.[213] He met with his counterparts from Austria, Britain, Greece, and the Ionian Islands, and together with several of the port's foreign merchants they drew up a protest against revolutionary propaganda activities. Brăila was 'essentially commercial and principally inhabited by foreigners.' Its inhabitants accepted 'the *de facto* government without opposition,' but as they were foreigners they felt they should be 'exempted by the government from all political agitation.'[214] The three government propagandists had excited the spirit of the people and threatened public order. If they acted under the authority of the administrator of Brăila, then the foreign representatives requested he order them to stop compromising the city's tranquillity, and if the propagandists were agents of the principality's government, then they demanded that the government recalled them without delay.[215] The diplomats considered Brăila to be a Wallachian city in name alone. It was a foreign enclave in their eyes. It would accept the revolution, but it wouldn't participate, and it couldn't tolerate a threat to public order.

Struggles against urban disorder exposed the difficulties that could arise from a failure to recast local government in the revolution's image. A united front was needed to maintain order and keep central government informed. Two reports reached Bucharest from Giurgiu in the early days of the revolution. They concerned the arrival of Prince Bibescu's deposed Interior Minister, Alecu Vilara, and his son-in-law, Scarlat Crețulescu, in the port. The magistrates wrote that Vilara and his supporters had attempted to raise the city's inhabitants against the revolutionary cause. A confrontation followed, and an officer who sided with

[212] *Anul 1848,* II, 636-638.
[213] BAR, Mss Rom 3834, 33-34.
[214] BAR, Mss Rom 3834, 37r. 'Que Ibraila étant essentiellement commerçante et principalement habitée par des étrangers, il est du devoir de ses habitants d'accepter le Gouvernement de facto. Sans opposition, et après, d'être exemptés par le Gouvernment de toute action et agitation politique.'
[215] BAR, Mss Rom 3834, 37-38. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 660-662.

Vilara had drawn his pistol and wounded the president of the magistracy. His colleagues begged the Interior Ministry to send help. Vilara and his allies had fled under German passports, but the city remained in danger. Additional guardsmen were required to maintain order, and the local governor, who was 'an inveterate partisan,' needed replacing.[216] The governor's report offered a different account of the conflict. It had begun when two of Vilara's supporters, Ioan Manu and Michalache Cornescu, had passed through the city. They were on their way to take in the waters, but the president of the magistracy, Grigore Popovici, and a local schoolteacher named Zaharia Boerescu believed them to be travelling under forged passports and confronted the two men. A detachment of soldiers was dispatched to calm the crowds, but the people threatened them and drove them back to the barracks. The order to fire was given reluctantly, and Popovici was wounded in the confusion.[217] The Provisional Government preferred the magistrates' account and removed the governor from office.[218]

The new government also faced logistical challenges in abolishing Roma slavery. Article fourteen of the Islaz Proclamation promised the emancipation of the principality's Roma slaves through compensation. Only a handful of people had advocated the abolition of slavery during the 1830s, but it became a rallying cause for the educated young men of the 1840s, who considered slavery an abomination. In his *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les mœurs et la langue des Cigains, connus en France sous le nom de Bohémiens,* the Moldavian writer Mihail Kogălniceanu criticised European intellectuals for ignoring the Roma. 'They form philanthropic societies for the abolition of slavery in America,' he wrote, 'while on their own continent, in Europe, there are four-hundred-thousand Roma slaves and two-hundred-thousand others who live in the darkness of ignorance and barbarism.'[219] There were three kinds of Roma slave in the Danubian Principalities. Those belonging to the state and the monasteries were liberated in Wallachia in 1843 and 1847 respectively, but many more remained in private hands, and the revolutionary government mishandled their emancipation during the summer of 1848.[220] A

---

[216] *Anul 1848,* I, 552-553. 'e un vederat partisan.'
[217] BAR, Mss Rom 3858, 33&42. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* I, 554-555.
[218] The governor was likely a relative of Vilara's as he shared his surname. He doesn't appear on the list of local administrators named by the Interior Department at BAR, Mss Rom 3857, 39.
[219] Kogalnitchan, *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les mœurs et la langue des Cigains,* iv. 'ils forment des sociétés philanthropiques pour l'abolition de l'esclavage en Amérique, tandis qu'au sein de leur continent, en Europe, il y a quatre cent mille Cigains qui sont esclaves et deux cent mille autres qui sont couverts des ténèbres de l'ignorance et de la barbarie !'
[220] On the shift in mentality surrounding Roma slavery during the 1830s and 1840s, see Viorel Achim, Richard Davies trans., *The Roma in Romanian History*, (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004), 87-112; Kogălniceanu celebrated Roma emancipation in Moldavia in a special supplement to *Propășirea* published in February 1844. See Costinescu, *Propășirea*, 98-101; On Roma emancipation and the revolution, see Venera

three-man commission was established in Bucharest to oversee the process. All Roma slaves and slave owners had to present themselves before this commission in person. Slaves would receive billets of freedom and former owners their compensation. The commission was charged with investigating every claim, which was an unmanageable task. It's unclear how many slaves appeared before the commission, but over the summer more than fifty-three thousand billets of freedom were printed for its use.[221] Bucharest couldn't support the influx of people, and the Roma lost many days of labour in travelling across the country. In early August the commission asked the Interior Minister to give orders that Roma should appear before their local administrators and sub-administrators instead, and a second commission was established in Craiova to deal with cases from Oltenia, although it didn't begin its proceedings until early September.[222]

Disputes between freed slaves and their former owners jeopardised revolutionary peace, and the government appealed to public order in its addresses to the Roma. Many slave owners found novel ways to resist the government's order. The Islaz Proclamation had liberated the Roma, but it said nothing of their clothes. The Bucharest Police Chief Mărgărit Moșoiu investigated several cases of wealthy men casting their former slaves naked into the street, and such cases were not limited to the Wallachian capital.[223] Nae Racovițeanu of Olt County also withheld his slaves' clothes along with other possessions that they needed to ensure their free livelihood.[224] Those Roma who did escape the clutches of their owners often found themselves with little to do while they waited to receive their billets of freedom, and the administrator of Dolj County complained on 21 August that their presence in Craiova had brought 'countless disturbances of public order.' Some were provoked by the Roma themselves. Others were caused by their former owners' efforts to restrict their freedom.[225] The commission worried about the effects that its actions might have on local communities. It had freed the Roma, but it didn't want them to exercise too much freedom. On 25 July, the three members of the Bucharest commission wrote to the Interior Minister advising him to send word to the local administrators and the Bucharest police department. Roma were asked

---

Achim, 'Emanciparea țiganilor și programul legislative al guvernului provizoriu din 1848', *Revista Istorică*, XX (2009), 63-72.

[221] BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 105r.

[222] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 12. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* II, 634-635; BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 102; the second commission was formally established on 7 September. See BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 138.

[223] For the details of cases from Bucharest, see chapter 2 above.

[224] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 85. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 306.

[225] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 89. '…din minutul libărări foștilor robi și pînă acum, sau întîmplat nenumărate ne-orîndueli vătămătoare liniștii publice, atît din partea emancipaților care dorea a să bucura de dreptul libertății, cît și din partea posesorilor lor care se înpotrivea ai lăsa liberi și ale da tot deodată I lucrurile ce au fost ale acelora.'

to 'remain in the cities and villages where they are now settled and to keep up their trades, not to go wandering and causing social unrest.'[226] This wasn't an order. It was a request, like the appeals to the peasantry to continue working the fields. To order the Roma to remain in situ or the peasants to work the fields would place restrictions on their sovereignty, which would be contrary to the message of the Islaz Proclamation. Government was to be based in popular consent, and this meant threats to public order needed to be dealt with by appeals to man's better nature.

The abolition of Roma slavery and the promised emancipation of the peasantry inspired foreigners in the principality who shared their plight. A Russian Colonel Cuneschi of Ialomița County protested to the local administrator. He owned thirteen serfs whom he had brought with him from Russia, and he told the local authorities that they could not be freed without the Russian consul's approval. The county administrator referred the case to the Interior Department, and his report did not describe the Russians as serfs, but as men.[227] Several similar cases were reported in Dolj, and the local administrator wrote to the Interior Minister soliciting his advice on 8 September. Rosetti replied that the government 'could not give billets of freedom to foreigners, but when one of the owners of these slaves complains that they have fled and asks for our help, we can reply that the Wallachian lands do not know slavery.'[228] For Rosetti at least, liberty came before stability.

The revolutionary quest to create a new national political culture pitted the principality's wealthiest inhabitants against its poorest ones. Local administrations were transformed to lay the foundations of this new political culture. Opponents of the revolution were removed from office and replaced with men willing to serve the cause. Propagandists were sent into the countryside to educate local priests, schoolteachers, and peasants about the revolutionary programme. Pageants were staged and oaths and petitions sworn and signed. A new symbolic order was needed to embed the revolution in the popular imagination. It embraced the bulk of the Wallachian people and offered them the chance to become self-

---

[226] BAR, Mss Rom 3856, 3r. 'Comisia roagă dar pe Onorabilul Ministeriu ca să în cunoștiințeze, atît Poliția din capitală, cît și Administrațiilor du prin județe, să cunoască de acum liberi pe toți țiganii și a nu mai îngădui pe foștii lor posesori a-I ținea în silnicie îngrijind numai acele autorități locale ca toți țigani să rămîe ne strămutați de pe la orașile sau satele unde acum ei se află așezați, și ca toți aceștia să fie ocupați în meserile lor, și să nu umble haimanale, pricinuind vreo neliniște soțietăți.'

[227] BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 50-54; ANIC, 601/27/1848, 198.

[228] BAR, Mss Rom 3882, 54. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 719. 'Noi nu putem da bileturi la străini, însă când cine-va din stăpânii acelor robi va reclama că i-a fugit robul, cerând să dea ajutor, îl va răspunde că pe pământul românesc nu cunoaște rob…' The Dolj Administrator's report refers to 'sclavi rusești,' or Russian slaves, rather than robi. Robi was the former term used for serfdom, but it was also used to describe Roma slaves. I have translated it as 'slaves' here as Rosetti is making a broader statement about slavery, although the people to whom the term refers were most likely Russian serfs.

sufficient and sovereign citizens. This meant freedom for the Roma and land for the peasantry, who proved adept at exploiting the rhetoric of revolution to express particular grievances. The government struggled to balance these interests with those of the landowners and boyars. Liberty could not undermine order, and freedom needed to be weighed against property to win and maintain the support of all the Wallachians. The balance proved difficult to maintain as summer drew towards autumn. Unrest and disorder rocked cities and villages alike. Plots were hatched and peasants refused to perform their traditional labour obligations. Both these activities threatened the revolutionary order. They undermined claims of universal support and put the principality's food supply at risk. The revolution had transformed local grievances into national political questions. These were not questions that the Wallachian revolutionaries faced alone. Revolutionary leaders across Europe attempted to grapple with the competing objectives of order and freedom, and liberty and property. The most successful was Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, who positioned himself as the voice of all the French people in his electoral campaign in December. The Wallachian government wasn't so politically astute, and it failed to answer the questions it posed. It might have succeeded with more time and resources, but it was short on both. Foreign support was needed to survive.

IV. Wallachia Before Europe

Wallachian foreign policy during the revolutionary summer drew its ideological bearings from Paris in February and March. The spring of 1848 seemed to inaugurate a new European order in the French capital, in which the peoples of Europe would struggle side by side to free themselves from the yoke of an oppressive old order. Gustave Flaubert captured the mood in his *l'Education Sentimentale.* After forty-eight hours without sleep on the barricades of the Latin Quarter and in the halls of the Tuileries and the *Hôtel de Ville,* the republican shop worker Dussardier meets his friends Frédéric and Hussonet in the street. He throws his arms around them. 'The Republic has been proclaimed,' he says. 'We shall be happy now.' Happiness would not be limited to the Parisians or the French alone. He tells his two friends that journalists are discussing the liberation of Poland and Italy. 'No more kings,' he says. 'You understand what that means? The whole world free! The whole world!'[1] Dussardier's optimism was shared by the real-life actors of February. The city was soon awash with flags. They fluttered from windows and flew above buildings. People strung together blue, white, and red handkerchiefs to form makeshift tricolours, and the Swiss-Jewish actress Rachel ended every performance she gave at the *Comédie-Française* by waving the French flag and singing *La Marseillaise.*[2] It was not only the French flag that could be found in the streets of Paris during spring. The German writer Fanny Lewald spotted the red, black, and gold standard of the German national movement on 19 March. It billowed above a crowd on the Rue Royale, and the people beneath it cried 'Take the revolution to Vienna! The Republic to Vienna! The abdication of Prince Metternich'[3] Metternich had already fallen, and the news soon filtered through. It appeared on the front page of *Le Constitutionnel* the following morning: 'the old Europe is no longer recognisable.'[4] It must have seemed as though Lafayette's prophecy of 1789 would soon be fulfilled. The military hero of the American Revolution had stood on the steps of the *Hôtel de Ville,* raised the revolutionary cockade above his head, and foretold an empire of liberty. Its symbol would travel around the world. It was 'bound to

[1] Flaubert, *Sentimental Education,* 316. Original French: 'La République est proclamée ! on sera heureux maintenant ! Des journalistes qui causaient tout à l'heure devant moi, disaient qu'on va affranchir la Pologne et l'Italie ! Plus de rois ! comprenez-vous ! Toute la terre libre ! toute la terre libre !'
[2] Maurice Samuels, *The Right to Difference: French Universalism and the Jews*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), 68-72.
[3] Lewald, *A Year of Revolutions,* 75.
[4] *Le Constitutionnel,* 20 March 1848. 'La vieille Europe n'est plus reconnaissable.'

triumph over the old tactics of Europe,' and it would 'reduce arbitrary governments to the alternative of being conquered unless they imitated it.'[5]

Outpourings of cosmopolitan nationalism seemed to confirm Nicolae Bălcescu's belief that the February Revolution would 'change the face of the world', and the Wallachian revolutionary government adopted its rhetoric and principles in foreign appeals.[6] One of the largest demonstrations in Paris came on 17 March. Between 150,000 and 200,000 marchers processed to the *Hôtel de Ville* in support of the Provisional Government. William Sewell described it as a 'triumph for Parisian workers,' nearly all of whom 'marched by trade, preceded by the banner of their corporation.' The corporations, he argued, were the 'closest equivalent…to the sections of 1792-4.' They formed 'constituent units of the sovereign people and of the republic.'[7] Delegations delivered gifts to the *Hôtel de Ville* over the following days, and they were joined by representatives of the city's foreign communities. If the corporations of Paris were 'constituent units' of the revolution, then these foreign delegations played the same role. Some two thousand Savoyards living in the city waited alongside journeymen carpenters, schoolteachers, and bureaucrats on 20 March, and the following day brought Belgian democrats and students from Moldavia and Wallachia. They were received by the Deputy Mayor of Paris, Philippe Buchez, suggesting that civic and European identities blurred during the spring. Buchez spoke to the Wallachian and Moldavian students of the 'universal fraternity' of the nations of Europe. 'Consider us your brothers,' he begged. 'That which was done in Paris was not only a French work, but a European work.' He accepted their national standard and told them that it would join 'the numerous flags of the European nations, which are all reunited here as a symbol of the union of peoples.'[8] Such language would become a defining feature of Wallachian foreign policy, which drew on the principles of popular sovereignty and public opinion.

But the changing revolutionary landscape of the summer of 1848 would undermine the logic of the 'Springtime of Peoples,' and Wallachian representatives could not adapt to the new geopolitical reality. The Moldavian and Wallachian students gathered nightly to talk about how they could translate the revolution in Paris to their homelands during March. They discussed an alliance with Adam Czartoryski and his Polish circle at the *Hôtel Lambert* on

---

[5] Quoted in Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution,* (London: Penguin Books, 1989), 385.
[6] See introduction for Nicolae Bălcescu's response to the events of 24 February.
[7] Sewell, *Work and Revolution,* 251-265.
[8] *Le Constitutionnel,* 22 March 1848. '…vous devez nous considérer comme vos frères…ce qui s'est fait à Paris n'est pas seulement une œuvre française, c'est une œuvre européenne… Nous acceptons votre drapeau ; nous allons le joindre à ces nombreux drapeaux des nations de l'Europe, qui sont tous réunis ici comme un symbole de l'union des peuples.' A Romanian translation of this article appeared in *Gazeta de Transilvania* in April/May. See *Anul 1848,* I, 140-141.

the *Île Saint-Louis,* and Dumitru and Ion Brătianu sought personal assurances of French support from Lamartine before they returned to Bucharest.[9] They left the French capital before the mood changed in May and June. Traian Ionescu has argued that this was the first mistake of the Wallachian Revolution. Nobody stayed behind in Paris to forge closer links with the French Provisional Government or take stock of the changing revolutionary landscape.[10] News travelled slowly, and by the time the Wallachian Provisional Government was in a position to despatch its envoys in late June, their message of the unity of peoples no longer carried the same currency, and Wallachian representatives found themselves competing with other national movements rather than speaking in concert. Italy was the more pressing foreign concern for the Great Powers of Europe, which were also preoccupied with their own domestic affairs. Only Russia and the Ottoman Empire treated the Wallachian Revolution as a priority.

The fall of Bucharest in September forced Wallachian revolutionary diplomats to substitute geopolitical concerns for ideological ones. Foreign appeals during the summer were framed in the language of the brotherhood of nations and the new liberal European order. Revolutionaries believed that the traditional diplomatic norms founded upon strategic interest had been superseded, but the Ottoman invasion brought them back to the fore. Wallachian exiles attempted to frame the position of the two principalities in terms of the broader European geopolitical order. Moldavia and Wallachia had acted as bulwarks against the Muslim threat during the medieval era. After September 1848, the Wallachian revolutionaries argued they could serve as a barrier against Russian expansion. In doing so, they discussed the 'question' of the Danubian Principalities.[11] It was an approach common to many of the smaller nations of Europe in the nineteenth century. As Holly Case has shown, in the 1830s the 'aggregation of questions under the heading of "European questions" was an institutionalized practice.' Poland led the way. The first pamphlet on the Polish question appeared in French in 1829. 'The Polish interest,' it said, 'is inseparable from that of Europe.' But the reformulation of national questions as European ones became more widespread after the failure of the revolutions of 1848 to redraw the map of Europe. Lajos Kossuth gave speeches in Britain on 'the historic great open questions that threaten Europe with unrest'

[9] Bodea, *Lupta Românilor,* 107-110; Iulian Oncescu, 'Les Polonais et les Roumains et leur rôle dans la transformation de la cause nationale en problème européen (1830-1866)', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, XLVIII (2009), 181-193.
[10] Traian Ionescu, 'Activitatea consulatelor franceze din principatele române în timpul revoluției de la 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 809-834. A Romanian-speaking Bukovinan remained in Paris and acted as an unofficial agent at times, but none of the Wallachians stayed back.
[11] See, for instance, D. Bratiano, *Documents Concerning the Question of the Danubian Principalities dedicated to the English Parliament*, (London: E. Detkens Bookseller, Stationer, &c., 1849).

during his exile, and his Wallachian contemporaries adopted similar rhetoric.[12] They had valorised European civilisation in the pre-revolutionary years. The Springtime of Peoples had seemed to herald the dawn of a new era of European unity, but those brief months of the brotherhood of nations soon gave way to years of commercial and geopolitical imperatives. The cause of European unity had failed, and the Wallachians needed to adapt to the new geopolitical reality to make themselves heard.

Summer Struggles

The outbreak of revolution in Bucharest coincided with the June Days in Paris, and the Wallachians were unable to adapt to the new revolutionary landscape. On the same day that Florian Aaron related the news of the peaceful revolution in Bucharest to his friend George Barițiu in Transylvania, *Le Constitutionnel* described the scenes of 23 June in Paris. A 'terrible riot' had bloodied the French capital and transformed several districts of the city into battlefields.[13] Aaron wrote of men and women embracing in the streets. *Le Constitutionnel* reported home invasions and the rise of barricades. The Wallachians were united. 'We are free,' wrote Aaron, 'and from now on will rejoice in all the rights we deserve.'[14] But Paris was divided. A civil war had broken out in the streets. It was an unhappy coincidence for the Wallachian cause. The Venetian revolutionary leader Daniele Manin took the news of the June Days as a sign that French aid would not be forthcoming.[15] His Wallachian contemporaries were not so astute. The imperfect synchronicities of the revolution confounded them. Their representations before the Great Powers of Europe assumed the logic of the Springtime of Peoples endured, but it had fallen as the Wallachians rose up for themselves.

Revolutionary unity was at the heart of the Wallachian message. The new Provisional Government had been installed on the back of the common will of the people and without a drop of blood being spilled. Tsar Nicholas I was informed that the revolution was 'peaceful and full of dignity,' and that it had taken less than three hours to accomplish without any

[12] Case, *Age of Questions,* 35-71. See page 50 for the pamphlet on the Polish question & page 54 for the Kossuth quotation.
[13] *Le Constitutionnel,* 24 June 1848. 'Une émeute terrible a aujourd'hui ensanglanté Paris, qui ressemble sur plusieurs points, à un champ de bataille.'
[14] Aaron to Bariț, 12/24 June 1848, reproduced in Pascu, *George Barițiu,* I, 69. 'Noi sîntem emancipați și ne vom bucura de aici înainte de toate drepturile de care sîntem vrednici.'
[15] On Manin and Venice, see Ginsborg, *Daniele Manin,* 244-249.

disturbance or even the slightest unrest.[16] The same message was sent to the Austrian, British, and Prussian ambassadors in Constantinople. They were told that the revolution of 23 June had passed 'without even a spark of violence.' The revolution's peaceful nature demonstrated its popularity. The absence of struggle made it clear that this was indeed the work of 'all the people.'[17] It was, as the Foreign Secretary Ion Voinescu II put it in an address to the French General Aupick at Constantinople, an 'entirely democratic demonstration.' The people had simply exercised the rights that were accorded to them by treaties between the Ottoman Porte and the medieval Princes Mircea and Vlad V.[18]

Public opinion and popular support became tools of foreign policy under the Wallachian revolutionary governments. The Islaz Proclamation had been issued in the name of the Wallachian people, and the Provisional Government sought to mobilise them in its relations with Russia and the Ottoman Porte. Petitions to the Tsar and the Sultan were circulated throughout the country in July so that the people could add their names to those of their elected officials. The use of petitions in domestic matters has a long history in Europe. The Levellers of mid-seventeenth-century Britain often used petitions to articulate their grievances, and almost sixteen thousand people in London signed the 'monster' petition of 1680 that called for the trial of Catholic plotters. Their use expanded in the nineteenth century. Around three thousand petitions for electoral reform appeared in France in the years 1839-1840, and they attracted 188,956 signatures. The three Chartist petitions of 1839, 1842, and 1848 were even more successful. Each garnered more than a million signatures.[19] But all of these petitions were domestic matters. They were signed by the subjects and citizens of the state to whose government they were presented. Petitions to foreign powers were rarer. Adam Czartoryski had organised a petition of Polish refugees to the British Parliament in 1831, but the government refused to accept it, and Poland's advocate Lord Ebrington was forced to

[16] *Anul 1848,* II, 58-9. '…o revoluție liniștită și plină de dignitate…Această revoluție s'a sfîrșit în mai putin de trei ceasuri, fără a se fi întîmplat cea mai mică nenorocire și fără ca să se fi turburat cât de puțin liniștea obștească.'
[17] *Anul 1848,* II, 81. 'Cette œuvre de régénération s'est accomplie le 11 (23) juin par un mouvement spontané de toute la population, sans aucune secousse violente…'
[18] *Anul 1848,* I, 593. 'Par une manifestation entièrement démocratique, faite le 11/23 du courant, le peuple Valaque…' See also BAR, Doc Ist DCCCXI/234 for an additional document from June 1848 on the origins of the rights of the Wallachians. The treaties that the Wallachians cited were almost certainly eighteenth-century fabrications. See Panaite, 'The Legal and Political Status of Wallachia and Moldavia'.
[19] On the historiography of petitions, see Mark Knights, '"The Lowest Degree of Freedom": The Right to Petition Parliament, 1640-1800', *Parliamentary History* 37 (2018), 18-34; Philip Loft, 'Involving the Public: Parliament, Petitioning, and the Language of Interest, 1688-1720', *Journal of British Studies* 55 (2016), 1-23; Mark Knights, 'London's "Monster" Petition of 1680', *The Historical Journal* 36 (1993), 39-67; Benoît Agnès, 'Le « Pétitionnaire Universel » : Les Normes de la Pétition en France et au Royaume-Uni pendant la première moitie du XIX^{e} Siècle', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 58 (2011), 45-70; Pickering, 'Chartist Petitioning in Popular Politics'.

substitute a petition signed by his own constituents.[20] Moldavian and Wallachian boyars had also addressed petitions to foreign rulers in the nineteenth century. Several were sent to the Tsar and the Sultan, and one was even addressed to Napoleon, but all of these documents were signed by only a few people, and they were not organised by a sitting government.[21] Copies of the Wallachian petitions to the Tsar and the Sultan were sent by central government to local administrators with instructions to gather as many signatures as possible.[22] Almost 100,000 people lent their names to the cause.[23] It was an unprecedented example of popular sovereignty as a tool of foreign policy, and in September Alexandru G. Golescu urged the Foreign Minister Ion Voinescu II to repeat the tactic. The only hope for the Wallachian cause lay in the mobilisation of European public opinion. He advised Voinescu to send an address of the Wallachian people to 'all the peoples of Europe, especially the French, German and English,' as well as to the courts, parliaments, and assemblies. They should be signed, Golescu suggested, by 'as many thousands of citizens as possible, like the one that was sent to the Sublime Porte.'[24] The Wallachian revolutionaries had taken the message of the Springtime of Peoples to heart. Their revolution had been accomplished in the name of the people, and it was the people who spoke to the Great Powers of Europe.

The revolutionaries looked to France as their ideological guide. Many had spent formative years in Paris and developed lifelong friendships, and they sought to exploit these for the revolutionary cause. Ion Brătianu and C.A. Rosetti wrote to Edgar Quinet on 8 July. 'It is your spirit,' they told him, 'that animates us, your ideas that we have tried to translate…After God, it is you, it is Michelet.' France was their 'second homeland,' and they begged Quinet to remind the French nation that 'we are its sons, that we have fought for it on the barricades. All that we have done, we have done after its example.'[25] Their words echoed Nicolae Bălcescu's letter to Vasile Alecsandri of February, and they demonstrate the extent to

---

[20] On Czartoryski's work in Britain during this time, see Marian Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), 193-208.
[21] See Georgescu, *Mémoires et projets de réforme*.
[22] For examples from Prahova, Romanați, Râmnicu-Sărat, Olt, and Brăila counties, see BAR, Mss Rom 3862, 24-60.
[23] Figure taken from an address to the French Foreign Minister by A.G. Golescu in November. See *Anul 1848,* V, 540-542.
[24] *Anul 1848,* IV, 200. 'Cette circonstance vus fera sentir tout le prix d'une adresse du peuple valaque à tous les peuples de l'Europe et particulièrement aux peuples : français, allemand et anglais, adresse signée par plusieurs milliers de citoyens, dans le genre de celle qui doit avoir été envoyée à la Sublime Porte.'
[25] *Anul 1848,* II, 134-135. 'C'est votre esprit qui nous a animés ; ce sont vos idées que nous avons essayé de traduire…après Dieu, c'est vous, c'est Michelet…La France s'est levée, et l'Europe tout entière s'est levée à sa voix…Le ciel est serein sur nos têtes, mais des nuages sont à l'horizon. Ils s'avancent vers nous, poussés par le vent du Nord, et portant dans leurs flancs la mort, la barbarie, l'esclavage…Tout notre espoir est donc en vous, en notre seconde patrie…Rappelez encore à la France que nous sommes ses fils ; que nous avons combattu pour elle sur les barricades. Ajoutez que ce que nous avons fait, nous l'avons fait à son exemple.'

which the Wallachians conceived of the revolution as part of a broader European struggle. The French Foreign Minister Alphonse de Lamartine had encouraged that interpretation. In spring he declared that the French Republic would 'consider itself at liberty to take arms for the protection of… legitimate movements of growth and nationality' on the part of 'certain oppressed nationalities.'[26] The Wallachian Provisional Government sang his praises in July. 'We have contracted a new debt towards France,' it informed him in an official government address. 'The word of God reached us in the mouth of a Frenchman.'[27] Without Paris in February, there could have been no Bucharest in June.

Wallachia had concrete needs that the government hoped France or another European power could meet. The Islaz Proclamation had promised compensation for slave- and landowners and the establishment of a new national bank, but the principality's finances were in a parlous state.[28] The new government was short of weapons too, and those that it did have were not fit for purpose. In early July the head of the National guard reported that all of the rifles he had found in the military arsenal were broken, and many members of Gheorghe Magheru's forces in Oltenia carried rifles with cracked barrels or missing hammers and cylinders.[29] The need for both weapons and financial assistance grew more pressing as the summer wore on. Responsibility for obtaining the two commodities fell to A.G. Golescu. He made no progress in Vienna in July and so moved on to Paris in August. His letter of accreditation laid out the government's objectives. He was to secure direct financial contributions and support for a national bank and a bureau of statistics.[30] His cousin Alexandru C. Golescu impressed the urgency of his mission upon him at the end of August. The government needed at least 50,000 rifles and 300 million piastres, for which it could offer all state-owned lands as well as the lands of the monasteries and the peasants as collateral. If Golescu couldn't raise the funds in Paris from the Bank of France or one of the city's private banks, then he was advised to make the same offer to the Rothschilds in Frankfurt, in Vienna, and elsewhere. 'My dear friend,' wrote Alexandru C., 'things here are not going as well as we hoped.'[31]

---

[26] Quoted in Giorgios Varouxakis, '1848 and British Political Thought on "The Principle of Nationality",' in Douglas Moggach & Gareth Stedman Jones eds, *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 140-161, 149.
[27] *Anul 1848,* II, 537-538. 'Nous venons de contracter une nouvelle dette envers la France…La parole de Dieu nous arrive par la bouche d'un Français.'
[28] See chapter 2 for the revolutionary government's financial and administrative problems.
[29] *Anul 1848,* II, 35-6; BAR, Mss Rom 3865, 45. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 580-582.
[30] BAR, Mss Rom 3832, 5-6.
[31] *Anul 1848,* III, 529-530. 'Mon cher ami, les affaires ici ne vont pas aussi bien que nous le voudrions.'

But the revolution's representatives abroad found themselves isolated and overstretched in the changeable climate of Europe. The historian Dan Berindei praised the diplomatic work of the revolutionaries. He admired their propaganda activities and their ability to address diplomatic and political circles and shape foreign public opinion, but A.G. Golescu's experiences don't support Berindei's judgement.[32] Golescu was set an impossible task, and his itinerary was astonishing. He wrote to Nicolae Bălcescu in July when he was 'just about to begin' his diplomatic work, 'that is, coming to an understanding with the Viennese Cabinet, with the German Confederation, and then with France and England.'[33] One man had been sent to do the work of four teams of diplomats, and he found himself cut off from events in his homeland.[34] He wrote to Bălcescu again on 6 August to complain. 'How can anybody trust in an agent,' he asked, 'who has no idea what's happening?' He urged Bălcescu to establish a commission charged with foreign correspondence to provide news to friends and newspapers abroad. 'Choose one man to correspond with Brașov,' he wrote, 'another with Vienna and others with Frankfurt, Berlin, Paris, et cetera. They should describe every event, no matter how small, and without the slightest delay… otherwise the newspapers will publish nothing.'[35] For all the government's sophisticated work embedding the revolution within the cities, towns, and villages of Wallachia, its approach to foreign relations was often lackadaisical. Letters went unanswered, and envoys were left to rely upon European newspapers for information about their revolutionary homeland. Spring had promised so much, and perhaps that sense of hope made the revolutionary government complacent. The allies to whom they hoped to appeal were often no longer in a position to help. Lamartine replied to the Provisional Government's address in late August. 'Your letter,' he wrote, 'was intended for a member of the Provisional Government of the Republic. It was received by a simple citizen with no power today other than his voice and his word.'[36] His letter captured the imperfect synchronicities of the revolutionary year perfectly. The Wallachian poet C.D. Aricescu wrote in his memoirs that 'revolution was in the air like the cholera, which raged in many parts of

[32] Berindei, *Revoluția română,* 334-5.
[33] *Anul 1848,* II, 616-617. 'de abia acum voiu începe lucrul cel mai principal, adecă înțelegerea cu Cabinetul Vienei și cu Confederația germană, apoi și cu Francia și Inglitera.'
[34] For more on Golescu's mission in Paris, see Traian Ionescu, 'Misiunea lui Al. Gh. Golescu la Paris în 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 27 (1974), 1727-1746.
[35] *Anul 1848,* II, 732. 'Cum se poate ca să aibă ei încredere într'un agent, care nu scie nimic din întîmplările cele din urmă…De ce nu întocmiți odată o comisie pentru corespondența străină?... Orînduiți oameni, unul pentru corespondența cu Brașov, altul cu Viena, altul cu Francfort, Berlin, Paris, etc. Datoria lor să fie a descrie toate evenimentele, chiar și faptele cele mici sau vorbele ce se fac despre revoluția noastră și aceasta îndată, fără cea mai mică întârziere, ca să se publice la vreme și nu prea târziu, căci altmintrelea nu mai publică nimic gazetarii.'
[36] *Anul 1848,* III, 185. 'Votre lettre était destinée à un membre du Gouvernement provisoire de la République, elle a été reçue par un simple citoyen, sans autre pouvoir aujourd'hui que sa voix, que sa parole.'

Europe that year; thrones fell to the breath of liberty as people fell to the breath of cholera.'[37] Aricescu meant that the revolution had crossed all Europe, but its spread was gradual, and it affected the continent unevenly.

Revolution in one theatre could compromise the revolution in another. Reinhart Koselleck argued that the objectives of different revolutionary movements often conflicted with one another. He gave the example of Schleswig-Holstein, which was prized by both the German and the Danish national movements, but could not belong to both. 'Since none of the postulated national boundaries were generally acceptable,' wrote Koselleck, 'revolutionaries fought among themselves. If their political manifestos had an international appeal, their actions were decidedly national in character.'[38] But this was only one way in which revolutionary movements came into conflict. The emissaries of smaller states found themselves competing for resources and attention. Vasile Mălinescu was one of the few Romanian-speaking students in Paris in February who didn't rush home. He was from the Austrian Bukovina, which remained free from upheaval, and Mălinescu acted for a time as an unofficial agent of the Wallachian government. He wrote to A.G. Golescu on 20 August describing the obstacles he faced in his attempts to procure weapons for the Wallachian cause. Mălinescu lacked money, he had no official accreditation from the Wallachian government, and he found himself competing against the representatives of other revolutionary parties. 'The Irish, the Danish, and Italians are all seeking weapons,' he reported.[39] There weren't enough rifles to go round, and those that could be found were difficult to transport. The frictionless movement of information and people that Reinhart Koselleck described was nothing like the reality.[40] Writing from Vienna in August, A.G. Golescu advised his compatriots that the Austrian Cabinet could not help with the transport of arms across its Hungarian territories. The Wallachians would have to treat with the Hungarian revolutionaries themselves, but they too were in need of weaponry, and it seemed unlikely they would grant the request.[41]

Wallachia was not a priority for the Great Powers of Western and Central Europe. Revolutions closer to home were more pressing. A Belgian diplomatic agent in Paris reported to his superiors in June that France was 'too occupied with her troubles to think of war and

---

[37] C.D. Aricescu, *Memoriile Mele,* (Bucharest: Profile Publishing, 2002), 89. 'Revoluțiunea fiind atunci în ae ca și holera, ce bântuia multe părți ale Europei în anul acela; tronurile cădeau la suflarea libertății, ca indivizii la suflarea holerei.'
[38] Koselleck, 'How European Was the Revolution of 1848/49?', 212.
[39] *Anul 1848,* III, 287. 'Irlandesii, Danii și Italienii cer arme.'
[40] See the introduction for a discussion of Koselleck's thesis.
[41] BNR, Fond Brătianu VI/13, 4-5. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* III, 150.

conquests,' and financial aid for the smaller nations of Europe would not be forthcoming either.[42] The agrarian crises of the years 1845-7 had led to credit shortages and a general deterioration of the financial conditions of the country.[43] The French treasury was low on funds, and what money it could raise was needed for the new system of commercial credit banks—the *Comptois d'Escompte*—that were inaugurated on 7 March.[44] Those 300 million piastres that A.C. Golescu urged his cousin to raise would not be forthcoming, and A.G. Golescu confirmed as much in a letter of 16 September to the Wallachian Foreign Minister. The French Foreign Secretary Jules Bastide had told him that the government's finances were in disarray and it would be impossible to provide rifles to the Wallachians without immediate payment.[45] The Prussians were busy negotiating with Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein and attending to the question of a future German national state, and Austrian authorities had revolutions at home and in Hungary and Italy to contend with. Wallachia was not a priority.

Italy was the more important international question for the Great Powers, and its prominence had consequences for other national revolutionary movements. Alphonse de Lamartine had been willing to countenance French military involvement in Italy during the spring, but by summer the government of the new President of the Council of Ministers Louis-Eugène Cavaignac was determined to avoid it. The Hungarian doctor of medicine Louis Mandl had befriended several of the Wallachian revolutionaries during his time in Bucharest as one of Lamartine's envoys in spring, and he reported to them on 20 August that the attention of the French government was now 'entirely absorbed by the Italian Question.'[46] Cavaignac, Bastide, and the majority of both the deputies of the National Constituent Assembly and the population at large all hoped to preserve peace.[47] There was talk of an entente with Russia, the Polish cause was relegated to secondary importance to avoid conflict with the German states, and Bastide sought rapprochement with Britain on the Eastern Question, too. 'Unfortunately,' reported Ion Ghica from Constantinople in August, 'the affairs of Italy closely link the policy of France to that of England, not only in Italy, but in all other respects.' The French Ambassador General Aupick would not act on Wallachia's

[42] Lawrence C. Jennings, *France and Europe in 1848: A Study of French Foreign Affairs in Time of Crisis,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 168.
[43] Berger, 'Economic Crises', 306.
[44] George Fasel, 'The Wrong Revolution: French Republicanism in 1848', *French Historical Studies*, 8.4 (1974), 654-677, 669.
[45] *Anul 1848,* IV, 200.
[46] *Anul 1848,* VI, 26. 'L'attention du gouvernement est maintenant entièrement absorbée par la question italienne.'
[47] Jennings, *France and Europe in 1848,* 194-195.

behalf without direct orders from Paris, and these were not forthcoming.[48] The French government had greater concerns than the fate of one small principality in Southeastern Europe, and Wallachia's envoys abroad grew more and more frustrated as summer drew to a close. In a letter of 16 September, A.G. Golescu complained to the Wallachian Foreign Minister that 'the indecisive and timid governments which govern the affairs of the French bourgeois republic and the majority of the constitutional states of Europe have an instinctive aversion for any measure even the least bit hazardous.'[49] Golescu was not alone in recognising the futility of his mission. His colleague Ion Maiorescu in Frankfurt faced the same problems. 'Germany is aflame,' he wrote in a letter to Golescu on 21 September. 'There are revolutions everywhere.' No united German government existed, Austria had become a 'Slavic power', and the Wallachians had no representative in London.[50]

Only Russia and the Ottoman Porte viewed events in Wallachia as a geopolitical priority. They had fought several wars over the territory, and although the Ottoman monopoly had been abolished by the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829, Wallachia still paid tribute to the Porte, and the principality exported the bulk of its wheat and maize to the Ottoman capital. Much of this went to feed the people of Constantinople, but merchants also re-exported Moldavian and Wallachian produce to other markets, making the two principalities an important resource for the Ottoman economy.[51] Russia's attitude to the revolutions in Europe was spelled out in two manifestos. The first was issued in March. It stated that Russia would not intervene in events in Europe unless they posed a direct threat to the internal stability of the country.[52] The Tsar was thinking of Poland when he published this manifesto, but the Russian consul in Bucharest, Charles de Kotzebue, made it clear to the liberal party in April that any uprising on their part would be met by a Russian invasion.[53] A second manifesto of 31 July clarified this position and extended the question of internal stability to the Ottoman Empire. It was known as the Saint Petersburg Manifesto,

---

[48] *Anul 1848,* III, 503. 'Malheureusement, les affaires d'Italie paraissent être de nature au représentant de France comme liant étroitement la politique de son pays à celle de l'Angleterre, non seulement en Italie, mais sur tous les autres points, de manière qu'il n'ose pas agir positivement sans instructions de son Gouvernement.'
[49] *Anul 1848,* IV, 200. 'Les gouvernements indécis et timides sont ceux qui dirigent actuellement les affaires de la République bourgeoise en France et de la plupart des états constitutionnels de l'Europe, ont une aversion instinctive pour toute mesure un peu hasardée.'
[50] *Anul 1848,* IV, 277. 'Germania toată fierbe: revoluțiuni pretutindeni; puterea centrală a unitei Germanii neconstituată încă; de Francia nerecunoscută, în Constantinopole fără representant! Austria apropae să devină putere slavică. Francia nu trimite nici o instrucțiune lui Opicq, în ceea ce se atinge de noi. La London n'avem pe nimeni.'
[51] On foreign trade and the two principalities between the Treaty of Adrianople and the beginning of the Crimean War, see Constantin Ardeleanu, *International Trade and Diplomacy at the Lower Danube: The Sulina Question and the Economic Premises of the Crimean War (1829-1853),* (Brăila: Editura Istros, 2014), 95-130.
[52] Roberts, *Nicholas I and the Russian intervention in Hungary*, 15-16.
[53] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 6 April 1848. TNA, FO78/742, 35v-36r.

and in it the Tsar drew a distinction between the great states of Europe, with whom Russia entered treaties 'from Power to Power,' and the small Danubian Principalities, which were not 'recognised states, but pure and simple provinces forming part of an Empire, tributaries to their Sovereign, governed temporarily by their princes, whose elections had to be sanctioned.' They owed their existence to treaties concluded between the Ottoman and Russian Empires, but in the name of a 'pretended nationality, the origin of which is lost in the dark recesses of history,' the Wallachians had tried to 'separate themselves from Turkey.' It was a dangerous precedent. If they succeeded, the Tsar wrote, then the Bulgarians, the Roumelians, and 'all the diverse peoples of which the Ottoman Empire is composed' would soon follow suit, leading to the dismemberment of the empire, whose integrity Tsar Nicholas described as 'more than ever an essential condition for the maintenance of the general peace.'[54] The Wallachians would not just be content with revolution in their own principality either. Nicholas charged them with planning a new and independent Daco-Romanian Kingdom, which would incorporate the Austrian territories of Transylvania, Bukovina, and the Banat, and the Russian province of Bessarabia, too. Revolution in Paris, Berlin, or Vienna was one thing, but a revolution on the Danube threatened the geopolitical order of Europe. It was not only a matter of internal politics or regeneration, as the Wallachians had put it.

The revolutionaries themselves emphasised their commitment to the existing geopolitical order of the South Danube. Perhaps influenced by the turn towards national communism under Nicolae Ceaușescu, many Romanian historians have interpreted the events of 1848 as being driven by a desire to escape foreign domination and establish a new and independent Romanian state.[55] These objectives were not the goals of the summer of 1848. The British consul in Bucharest R.G. Colquhoun reported to Lord Palmerston on 28

[54] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCXI/227. 'Mais il est bien évident qu'un pareil engagement ne pouvait s'appliquer qu'aux états européens, qui traitent avec nous de Puissance a Puissance, aux états indépendants, dont l'organisation sociale est sans relation quelconque avec les traites politiques qui ont réglé leur circonscription. Sur ceux-la, nous ne nous reconnaissons le droit, pas plus que nous n'avons la prétention, d'exercer aucune sorte de protection ou d'influence. Il en est autrement des Principautés, qui ne sont point des états reconnus, mais de pures et simples provinces, formant partie intégrante d'un Empire, tributaires de son souverain, gouvernées temporairement par des princes, dont le choix a besoin d'être sanctionné, et qui, quant a la Russie, n'oint politiquement d'existence qu'en vertu des traités conclu entre la Porte Ottomane et nous… Qu'au nom d'une prétendue nationalité, dont l'origine se perd dans la nuit des âges, les Moldo-Valaques en viennent une fois a se séparer de la Turquie, et en vertu du même principe, sous l'influence du même désir, on verra bientôt la Bulgarie, la Romélie toutes les races de langue diverses dont l'Empire-Ottoman se compose, prétendre aussi a s'émanciper, pour former chacune un état a part… dont l'integrité est a nos yeux, dans le bouleversement actuel de l'Europe, plus que jamais une condition essentielle pour le maintien de la paix générale."

[55] See, for instance, Stan, *Revoluția română,* 16 and Berindei, *Revoluția română,* 15.

July that the Wallachians were 'ready to do anything to meet the wishes of the Porte.'[56] A little over a week later Gheorghe Magheru wrote to Christian Tell advising him to 'encourage the people [to show that] we are always the servants of the Porte; we do not attack its interests, and it would be better to send an army to kill us all than to refuse our Constitution.'[57] But perhaps most telling was Florian Aaron's letter to George Barițiu in June. The British commitment to maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire was well known in Bucharest, and Colquhoun emphasised it in all his dealings with the young revolutionaries. It's possible they simply told him what he wanted to hear, and Magheru's advice to Tell was intended to help win Ottoman support. Aaron's letter was a private message to a friend, and it was written in the hopeful afterglow of 23 June. A 'native national administration—as is written in the treaties—will no longer be an empty idea,' he wrote. The Wallachians would 'continue to support the Porte and pay the tribute,' and Russia, he believed, 'will protect us when the Turks upset us.' It was only in the internal administration of the country that the Wallachians would 'suffer nobody to meddle.'[58]

Close relations with the Ottoman Porte were essential for the future of Wallachia. If the revolutionaries had erred in leaving no agent behind in Paris when they headed home in spring, they did not make the same mistake in establishing contact with the Porte. Ion Ghica travelled to Constantinople in late May, almost a month before the revolution began, to represent the 'ideas and wishes' of a group of Wallachians who were 'desirous of assuring the internal prosperity of their country under the aegis of the Ottoman Empire.'[59] He carried a letter from these 'highly influential' Wallachians. Among the signatories were the two Brătianu brothers, five members of the Golescu family, Nicolae Bălcescu, Ion Heliade Rădulescu, and C.A. Rosetti, and his position was formalised by the new government upon its accession to power. A courier left Bucharest as the bells rang through the night of 23 June. He carried official documents naming Ghica the new Wallachian agent to the Porte.[60] A subsequent letter from the new Foreign Secretary Ion Voinescu II urged him to expend all his

[56] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 28 July 1848. TNA, FO 78/744, 203v.
[57] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 46r. Also reprod in *Anul 1848,* II, 752. '…să încurajați pe popol ca să roage cu curaj, că sîntem tot-deauna supuși Porței, nu-I atacăm interesele, și mai bine primesc să trimiță oștiri să ne omoare pe toți, decât să refuse Constituția.'
[58] Aaron to Bariț, 12/24 June 1848, reproduced in Pascu, *George Bariț,* I, 69. 'Rusia ne va protegia cînd turcii ne vor supăra, și cînd noi nu vom fi în stare de a ne apăre, dar in administrația dinlăuntru a țării nu vom suferi ca să se amestice nimini. Constituția proclamată ieri va fi un adevăr, și noi vom ști a muri pentru dînsa. Să trăiască românii!!.'
[59] *Anul 1848,* I, 398. 'Quelques-uns des Valacs, les plus influents, désireux d'assurer la prospérité intérieure de leur pays sous l'égide de l'intégrité de l'Empire Ottoman, ont l'honneur d'envoyer Monsieur Ion Ghica comme agent confidentiel et comme représentant de leurs idées et de leurs vœux près du Ministère Impérial de Sa Hautesse le Sultan.'
[60] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 24 June 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 101v.

energy in convincing the Porte to recognise the new government and its reforms. 'The moment,' he wrote, 'is critical…if they pronounce in our favour, then the wellbeing of the country is assured.'[61] He passed Ghica an address meant for the Ottoman Foreign Minister. It emphasised the new government's loyalty to the suzerain power and grounded the revolution in the needs of the country and the Wallachian people, who had suffered under the old order. The Provisional Government had been established by 'the unanimous wish of the people' after the resignation of Prince Bibescu had threatened the principality's stability. Voinescu appealed to his Ottoman counterpart to prevent an armed intervention, which would 'paralyse our peaceful efforts to improve the present state of affairs.'[62] There were also signs that the Wallachians were planning for the future of their relationship with the Ottoman Empire. Ion Heliade Rădulescu recommended two young men to his colleagues on the Princely Lieutenancy. Their names were Iorgu Crețeanu and Grigorie Pereț, and they were among the top students in their graduating class at the St Sava College in Bucharest. Rădulescu suggested the new government should pay for them to continue their studies in the universities of 'Enlightened Europe.' Crețeanu would study literature, but Pereț was to learn 'Oriental languages, most especially the Turkish language.'[63] The new regime would need representatives who could deal with the Ottomans in their native tongue.

Russia posed the greatest threat to the Wallachian cause. The French consul Hory reported to General Aupick on 27 June that well-informed persons had told him that the Russian General Duhamel had been given full authority by Tsar Nicholas to invade. Charles de Kotzebue had said as much, too. He told Hory that he did not know the Tsar's precise intentions, but the attempt on Bibescu's life of 21 June, the rising of peasants in several regions of the country, and the defection of a part of the army to the revolutionary cause provided sufficient grounds for an immediate Russian occupation.[64] Voinescu sought international support to stave off this threat. He wrote to his French counterpart on 26 June. Wallachia was not in a position to defend itself against a Russian invasion, which would not

---

[61] *Anul 1848,* I, 594. 'La circonstance est grave, le moment est critique. Faites tous vos efforts pour décider la Sublime Porte à reconnaître la nouvelle réforme, qui s'est opérée très pacifiquement, à se prononcer en notre faveur, et le salut de la patrie est assuré.'

[62] *Anul 1848,* I, 595. 'Dans ces circonstances un Gouvernement provisoire, constitué par le vœu unanime du peuple… a dû s'organiser pour prévenir l'anarchie et maintenir le bon ordre, qui, du reste, ne laisse rien à désirer. Cependant, vu l'imminence d'une intervention armée, qui pourrait paralyser nos efforts pacifiques tendant à un état de choses meilleur, ce même Gouvernement a reconnu qu'un de ses premiers devoirs est de soumettre à la Sublime Porte la situation critique du pays…'

[63] BAR, Mss Rom 3893, 142r. '…propane Onorabilă Locotenențe qua să dea deslegare a se ajuta aquesti tineri la desăvîrșirea învățăturilor spețiale în universitățile Europii luminate… quell d'întîu să se aplice la studiul sciințelor literale, quell d'al doilea la învățătura limbilor orientale, și mai cu sémă a limbei Turcesti.'

[64] Hory to Aupick, 27 June 1848. CAD, 166PO/E/168.

only harm Wallachia's interests, but would endanger the future of both the Ottoman and Austrian Empires. It would 'suffocate' the Wallachian democratic movement and carry consequences for the future of Poland, Hungary, and the other neighbouring nations of Central and Eastern Europe.[65] It was one of the earliest references to geopolitical interest in Wallachian revolutionary diplomacy, but it was expressed in ideological rather than strategic language. A second address to the Executive Powers of France followed Odobescu's failed coup of 1 July. A Russian invasion, it said, would not only imperil Wallachia's future, but 'all of Europe, and the work of political regeneration to which France has attached herself.'[66] The end of revolution in one theatre could spell the end of revolution across the continent, and the Russian threat grew more pressing with the invasion of Moldavia on 7 July. The Provisional Government responded on 18 July. It published an address to the Tsar in the official newspaper *Monitorul Român* and distributed copies to local administrators to have the petition signed by the people. The Wallachian people, it said, had greeted the Organic Regulations favourably and seen their implementation as 'the dawn of their liberty and prosperity,' but abuses in their application had shattered these hopes. The revolution was meant to rectify this fault. It was calm and dignified, and it intended only to introduce a new legal order that was 'more in keeping with the progress of civilisation and the needs of the country.' The Provisional Government hoped that Nicholas could recognise this work of 'peaceful regeneration,' but if he refused then it called upon all of Europe for assistance, and it placed the principality under the immediate protection of the Great Powers.[67] The Saint Petersburg Manifesto made the Tsar's position clear thirteen days later, though a Russian invasion did not immediately follow.

Opponents of the revolution welcomed the possibility of a Russian occupation, and they lobbied the Tsar and his representatives to take action against the revolutionary government. Princess Cleopatra Trubetzkoi was the niece of the former Prince Grigore IV Ghica, and she wrote to her cousin Dimitrie on 10 July to express her delight at the news of the Russian

---

[65] *Anul 1848,* I, 565-566.

[66] BAR, Mss Rom 4634, 95v. A Romanian translation was reprod. in *Anul 1848,* I, 678-681. '…ce n'en pas seulement notre pays, c'en l'Europe entière, c'est l'œuvre de régénération politique a laquelle la France a attaché soi même, qui est en péril.'

[67] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCXI/231. 'Le Peuple Valaque qui a cru saluer dans le Règlement l'aurore de sa liberté et de sa prospérité, ayant reconnu son illusion après une triste expérience de dix-sept ans, vient de se donner par une révolution calme et pleine de dignité une loi plus en rapport avec les progrès de la civilisation et les besoins du pays… nous avons le ferme espoir que Votre Majesté Impériale ne se refusera pas a reconnaître cette œuvre de régénération pacifique.' Other copies of the Saint Petersburg Proclamation can be found at BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P CCVI/8, 5-9, which reproduces the version printed in a Frankfurt newspaper on 12 August, 1848 and BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P CCLXVIII/4, 22-23, which is a handwritten transcription of the proclamation by somebody called Diamandy.

invasion of Moldavia. She had heard stories of an imminent Ottoman occupation of Wallachia, and she described this rumour as a source of 'great happiness for us and our poor country.' She hoped that Dimitrie and the other 'noble Wallachians' who had fled to Transylvania would return soon.[68] Her wish went unfulfilled, and by the middle of August, many conservative boyars were pushing the Russians to act. Thirty-three men signed a petition to the Tsar on 21 August. Among them were members of the prominent Cantacuzino and Filipescu families as well as two doctors, a captain in the army, and many other men who had held public office. They decried the communist beliefs of the revolutionaries and threw themselves at Nicholas' feet to beg him to restore legitimate government.[69] Another petition was sent two weeks later by émigré boyars in Brașov, and it was signed by the former Prince Gheorghe Bibescu and the future Caimacam Constantin Cantacuzino. They too sought Russian assistance to overthrow the subversive and communist new order and reinstate legitimate government, and the similarity in the wording of the two petitions suggests that the two groups were acting in concert.[70]

Conservative appeals to Russia contested the revolutionary idea of Europe and the new government's claims to represent public opinion. Both the Provisional Government and the Princely Lieutenancy spoke in the name of the Wallachian people. Their proclamations and appeals to foreign powers were couched in the language of universal popular support, but conservative boyars in exile undermined this claim. Invitations to return sent by the government and the Ottoman representative Suleiman Pasha were ignored, and petitions to the Tsar argued that the revolution was unnatural and dangerous.[71] These men and women were not hostile to the idea of European civilisation itself. Both Gheorghe Bibescu and his brother Barbu Știrbei had studied in Paris during the Restoration, and Cleopatra Trubetzkoi hosted one of the most celebrated salons in Bucharest. She spoke excellent French, and when Franz Liszt visited Bucharest in 1847 he gave concerts at her home, but as Alex Drace-Francis has noted for the period prior to the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, the 'idea of Europe…could support an imperial, conservative…ideology, as well as one of liberty and independence.'[72] Petitions to the Russians reflected this alternative ideology. The forty-four

---

[68] BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXVI/3, 36. Also reprod in *Anul 1848,* II, 161-162. 'c'est un bonheur pour nous et pour notre pauvre pays'

[69] Peition of Wallachian boyars to Tsar Nicholas I, 21 August 1848. Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 220-221.

[70] Petition of boyar refugees to Tsar Nicholas I, 17/21 August 1848. Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 233-234.

[71] On attempts to encourage émigré boyars to return, see chapter 2.

[72] Iacob, *Elitele din Principatele Române,* 151; Fotino, *Din vremea renașterii,* II, 94; Drace-Francis, *Modern Romanian Culture,* 89.

citizens of Craiova who addressed General Lüders on 5 September accused the new order of arbitrary government, the same accusation that the revolutionaries themselves had made against Bibescu's regime. 'We are menaced,' wrote the Craiovans, by the possibility that 'our houses will be burned and demolished and we ourselves massacred.'[73] Disorder could be seen across Europe wherever the revolutionary seeds had been sown, and a petition delivered several months after the end of the revolution hinted at the way to avoid the same trouble in the future. A 'stronger and more stable government' was needed, it said, 'with greater means to repress the Satanic spirit of anarchy and the subversive doctrine of communism, which even now is visible in several parts of Europe.'[74] A closer relationship with Russia was required, and the authors of this petition suggested union with Moldavia under a Russian prince of the Tsar's own house. Europe did not need to be defined by the revolution, and unification could support a conservative agenda just as easily as a liberal one.

Russian policy forced the Ottomans to act and brought an end to the Wallachian Revolution in September. Suleiman Pasha had recognised the Princely Lieutenancy in August, and his conciliatory policy angered the Russian General Duhamel. He expressed his concerns to the Russian Foreign Minister Count Nesselrode on 14 August. His letter accused Suleiman of encouraging the 'demagogic party' and complained that he was treating with the rebels 'power to power.' This was not the means to 'force them to return to their duty,' and Duhamel worried that 'the complicity between the Ottoman Ministry and the revolutionary party' would only prolong the disruption. He advocated an immediate Russian invasion to bring about a 'satisfactory solution.'[75] Duhamel did not receive orders to invade, but the Russian Ambassador in Constantinople, Vladimir Pavlovich Titov, was working to change the Sultan's mind. Suleiman Pasha and Emin Effendi were recalled from Bucharest and replaced by Omer Pasha and Fuad Effendi. Both Ion Ghica and the French consul Hory attributed this change to Russian influence. Hory described Emin as the 'declared enemy of Russia,' and Ghica informed Voinescu in late August that the Russian mission in

---

[73] 44 boyars of Craiova to Luders, 24 August 1848. Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 245-247. '…on nous menace au contraire de démolir et d'incendier nos maisons et même de nous massacrer…'

[74] BAR, Doc Ist MDCLXXXVII/56 '…pentru încetarea unor asemenea calamități, un guvern mai tare și stabil, care prin urmare să fie mai în stare și să aibă mai multe mijloace de a reprima duhul satanic al anarhiei și al doctrinelor subversive ale comunismului, care, ivindu-se acum în urmă în unele părți ale Europei…'

[75] Duhamel to Nesselrode, 2/14 August 1848. Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 205. 'Il y a aujourd'hui douze jours que Suleyman-Pacha se trouve à Giurgevo et son inaction ne fait naturellement qu'encourager le parti démagogique, dont les protestations insolentes portent vraiment le cachet de la démence…il parlemente avec les rebelles, traite avec eux de puissance à puissance et réfère de chacune de leurs demandes à Constantinople. Ce n'est certes pas là le moyen de les faire rentrer dans le devoir, et je crains biens, que tout ce que j'au eu l'honneur d'exposer à Votre Excellence sur la connivence, qui existe entre le Ministère Ottoman et le parti révolutionnaire, ne soit que trop fondé et que sans l'intervention de notre corps d'occupation en Valachie, jamais cette question ne recevra une solution satisfaisante.'

Constantinople had 'reproached the commissars for having left the Lieutenancy in the hands of men who had been the architects of the revolutionary movement.'[76] Suleiman had instructed the new Princely Lieutenancy to send a deputation to Constantinople to present its reform programme to the Sultan, but on their arrival its members found the Ottoman government unwilling to meet them. They complained to the Foreign Minister Ali Pasha. Once again the Wallachians stressed the popular nature of their movement and its commitment to peace. They objected to the influence of an 'almost imperceptible minority,' which was maintained by an unnamed great and foreign power that was 'the enemy of all progress and all improvement in both the material and moral order' of the principality, and they begged for an audience with the Sultan.[77] Their request was ignored, and they soon returned home. Only Ion Ghica remained in the city, and there were few measures he could take. He reported to Voinescu on 11 September that most people in Constantinople believed the revolutionaries were attempting to introduce socialist and communist government, and the work of the short-lived Property Commission was taken as proof. He had provided Ali Pasha and the French and British ambassadors with detailed explanations of the government's conduct and plans, but there was little else he could do. He told Voinescu he was exhausted and begged permission to return to Bucharest for a few weeks. 'I desire it fervently,' he wrote. Several years would pass before he saw his homeland again. Ottoman soldiers would enter the Wallachian capital just two weeks later.

Fall and After

The fall of the Wallachian Revolution forced the revolutionaries to change their approach to foreign diplomacy. Their envoys had spoken as representatives of a legitimate government after Suleiman Pasha had recognised the Princely Lieutenancy, but the Ottoman occupation of Bucharest and the installation of Constantin Cantacuzino as Caimacam denied them this authority. They became exiles rather than envoys, and their changed status altered their objective. As envoys they had sought financial and diplomatic support for the new status

[76] Hory to Aupick, 8 September 1848. CAD, 166PO/E/168; Extracts of Ghica's letter were sent by R.G. Colquhoun to Palmerston, 6 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 21r. 'Elle reproche a ces commissaires, d'avoir laissé la Lieutenance entre les mains des hommes qui ont été les fauteurs du mouvement révolutionnaire.'
[77] *Anul 1848,* III, 556-562. 'un parti orme d'une minorité presque imperceptible dans la nation, mais soutenu par une grande Puissance étrangère, ennemie de tout progrès et de toute amélioration dans l'ordre matériel comme dans l'ordre moral…Que la Sublime Porte persiste dans son refus de reconnaître la députation valaque, que par l'envoi d'un nouveau Commissaire dans la Principauté, envoi qui implique le désaveu formel de tous les actes de son prédécesseur.'

quo. As exiles they hoped to redraw the map of Europe, and this amended objective affected their rhetoric, too. Wallachian diplomats during the summer had appealed to the principles of the European Springtime of Peoples and the brotherhood of nations. After September they focused on the geopolitical rather than ideological order of Europe. Their arguments were grounded in the political and economic interests of the Great Powers, and they attempted to reframe the 'question'—as it became—of the Danubian Principalities as one of Europe itself. It wasn't a novel approach. As Holly Case has shown, it was common during the nineteenth century to frame national questions as European ones.[78] Adam Czartoryski and his circle of Polish exiles were the pioneers in the 1830s, and the Wallachians adopted his model. They sought to influence public opinion and build networks of allies in key locations like London and Paris, and they began to discuss the future geopolitical order of Southeastern Europe. In its response to the Tsar's Saint Petersburg Manifesto of 31 July, the revolutionary government had written that 'a Daco-Romanian Kingdom is not yet a real and serious political consideration,' but after September they openly entertained the idea.[79] It wasn't the only potential future. The possibility of a Danubian Confederation that included the Hungarians and other peoples of Southeastern Europe was discussed too, but it was unification that would succeed after the Crimean War.

The Wallachian exiles were divided between Paris and the Ottoman Empire after the fall of the revolution, and they struggled to come together. Ștefan Golescu wrote to Ion Ghica from Paris in December 1848 of the need for the exiles to congregate in Constantinople to lobby the Ottoman government.[80] A lack of money was the greatest obstacle. Alexandru G. Golescu wrote to Ghica in the same month expressing his support for the idea, but he said that the exiles in Paris—including several Moldavians—had only one hundred guilders between them.[81] The new authorities in Bucharest took active steps to prevent the exiles accessing their capital in the principalities. Ion Ghica had placed the British agent Effingham Grant in charge of his assets, and Grant wrote to Ghica in late December to warn him that General Duhamel was attempting to confiscate all land held by the revolutionaries.[82] He urged Ghica to speak with the French and British ambassadors to see if they could prevent the policy being put into action, and in a follow-up letter of 22 January 1849 he encouraged

[78] Case, *Age of Questions,* 35-71.
[79] *Anul 1848,* III, 770. '…regatul daco-român nu este încă o considerație de politică reală și serioasă'
[80] *Anul 1848,* V, 663-664.
[81] *Anul 1848,* V, 658.
[82] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 29 December 1848, BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s7(14)/DCXVI.

Ghica to adopt several preventative measures to safeguard his finances.[83] The proposed confiscations were never enacted, but the Wallachian government did place other obstacles in the path of the exiles. When the British consul in Bucharest Robert Colquhoun wrote to the Wallachian Secretary of State in February 1852 regarding a mortgage that Dumitru Brătianu had taken out on his lands in the principality from London, he received a reply that any arrangement would need to be organised in person in Bucharest.[84] It was an impossible condition for a man living in exile.

Attitudes towards the Porte diverged among the Wallachian exiles. Twenty exiles formed a committee at Bursa in May 1849 to coordinate propaganda activities. Its membership comprised both Moldavian and Wallachian émigrés, and its leadership structure was designed to ensure fair representation for both principalities. The steering committee would have five members, of whom one would be named chairman. If the chairman was Wallachian, then three of the other four members would be Moldavian, and vice versa. The objective of the committee was explained in its founding document. It planned to 'work before the cabinets and peoples of Europe to unite the two principalities into a single state under Turkish suzerainty.'[85] Other Wallachian exiles had lost faith in the Ottomans after the joint occupation of the principalities in the autumn of 1848. Robert Colquhoun wrote to Stratford Canning in May 1849 expressing his fear that 'by degrees the friendly feeling in the minds of the Wallachians in favor of Turkey may be destroyed.'[86] A cursory read of Dumitru Brătianu's address to the British Parliament of the same year would have confirmed Colquhoun's fears. 'Monstrous as has been the conduct of Russia,' wrote Brătianu, 'the Wallachians have been less surprised at it than to see the Porte destroying with its own hands on the morrow the edifice which it had raised the day before.' He decried the change of policy between August and September. The Wallachians had 'thought the Turks were their friends…[and had] abstained from all resistance.' They were 'unfortunately doubly mistaken.'[87] Ion Heliade Rădulescu was horrified by Brătianu's pamphlet. He addressed his 'brothers in Bursa' on 1 August 1849. He had sworn to uphold the autonomy of the principality, he wrote, but also the suzerainty of the Porte. What would the world say when

[83] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 22 January 1849, BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s7(19)/DCXVI.
[84] BAR, Mss Rom 3835, 343 & 346-347.
[85] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P CCVI/8, 36r. '…să lucre pe lungă cabinetele si poparele europene pentru uniunea ambelor Principate într-un singulă etat tot subt suzeranitatea Turciei'
[86] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 12 May 1849. TNA, FO 78/788, 46r.
[87] D. Bratiano, *Documents Concerning the Question of the Danubian Principalities*, 9-11.

people saw the brochure that had appeared in London attacking the Porte?[88] The Wallachians needed to be sensitive to European geopolitics, and Rădulescu doubted that an open assault on their Ottoman suzerain would help their cause.

Domestic and international politics continued to undermine Wallachian diplomatic efforts in Western and Central Europe from September onwards. Ion Maiorescu was one of the first to recognise the need for a more strategic approach to diplomacy, but his work in Frankfurt was compromised by his failure to understand and appreciate what was happening in the German states during the summer and autumn. In a memorandum to the Frankfurt Parliament he proposed the exchange of the two Danubian Principalities for Austria's Italian possessions. 'Think how easy it would be to accomplish,' he told A.G. Golescu on 28 September, 'and think how useful it would be for all Europe, for the Eastern Question, and for Germany in particular.'[89] Maiorescu wrote of 'Germany' as though it were a European state with defined borders and an established government and not a contested idea. The German Confederation created by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 was an economic association, and it encompassed multiple nationalities, not all of whom supported the efforts of the Frankfurt Parliament to create a German state.[90] The Czech intellectual František Palacký had declined an invitation in April to serve on the Committee of Fifty that was drafting the Parliament's rules and procedures. He worried that a German Republic would lead to the downfall of the Habsburg Empire, of which he was a loyal subject, and he believed that its end would ease Russian expansion into Central Europe.[91] The Duchy of Schleswig-Holstein was another problem. The two territories were both provinces of the Danish kingdom and united by a common ruler, but only Holstein was part of the German Confederation, and nationalist outrage erupted when the new liberal government in Copenhagen announced the incorporation of Schleswig into a Danish nation-state.[92] Prussian soldiers marched into Denmark, and British, Russian, and Swedish pressure was needed to force an armistice at Mälmo on 26 August, but peace carried consequences in Frankfurt. The atmosphere in the city was febrile, and the news from the north led to violence. Barricades

---

[88] BNR, Fond Brătianu XL/12, 23r. Also reprod. in Ghica, *Amintiri din Pribegia după 1848*, 724. 'Pe autonomia țării și pe suzeranitatea Porții am jurat. Oare ce va zice lumea când dintre emigrați eș broșure ca cea dela Londra în care se atacă Poarta?'

[89] *Anul 1848,* IV, 398. 'Arăt cât de ușor se poate face aceasta și ce foloase mari pentru toată Europa, pentru cestuinea orientală și pentru Germania, în specie.'

[90] See Brian E. Vick, *Defining Germany: The 1848 Frankfurt Parliament and National Identity,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

[91] Jan Havránek, 'Bohemian Spring 1848 - Conflict of Loyalties and Its Picture in Historiography', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 124-139; Judson, *Habsburg Empire,* 206-208.

[92] Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 136-137.

rose, and sixty people died during the struggle between the city's workers and Prussian and Austrian soldiers.[93] Maiorescu arrived in Frankfurt some two weeks after the September Crisis began, and yet he seemed oblivious to both the consequences and the broader geopolitical problems of Central Europe.[94] He told Golescu that a copy of his memorandum had gone to Vienna with the liberal deputy Robert Blum, and that the ministers in Frankfurt had discussed its contents on 13 October. They felt that Germany had a great interest in preventing the principalities from becoming the spoils of war, but they could not intervene until the legislature had replaced the Provisional Central Power with a permanent one. The debate was scheduled to begin on 16 October, and Maiorescu reckoned it would take only twelve days to settle.[95] It was an optimistic assessment. Robert Blum was captured and executed in November after defending Vienna against the Austrian armies of Field Marshal Windisch-Graetz, the Frankfurt Parliament wouldn't finalise a constitution until March 1849, and its designated head of state, Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia, refused the title of 'Emperor of the Germans.' The 'Germany' of which Maiorescu had written in September 1848 was in no position to help.

The French government offered just as little hope to the Wallachians as the German states did. On 31 October Ion Maiorescu confessed to A.G. Golescu that he had 'never expected anything from France,' and nor would he. France had done little for Greece and Poland, and it had abandoned the Italians. 'If France will not help its Italian neighbours,' he wrote, 'who are necessary to maintain good balance between Germany and England, will it really help the Wallachians who are so far away?' The French people might be sympathetic, but their government was another matter. Perhaps in riposte to Lamartine's promise to the oppressed nations of Europe in spring, Maiorescu told Golescu that he judged on deeds, not words.[96] In November Golescu pleaded with the French Foreign Minister to offer support against Russian abuses. He told him that the Wallachian government had resigned itself to accept the stifling of its revolution in the interest of 'general politics,' but that since then the Russians had persecuted its citizens. Golescu requested only 'a few energetic words' on the

[93] Richard J. Evans, *The Pursuit of Power, Europe 1815-1914,* (London: Allen Lane, 2016), 199-200.
[94] For Maiorescu's movements, see Paul Barbu, 'Ioan Maiorescu - Activitatea sa politică și diplomatică (1848-1859) ', *Revista de Istorie*, 41 (1988), 419-436 and Ștefan Delureanu, 'Românii și "Germania" adunări naționale de la Frankfurt', *Revista Istorică*, IV (1993), 965-998.
[95] *Anul 1848,* V, 12-13.
[96] *Anul 1848,* V, 218. 'eu nici odată n'am așteptat nimic de la Francia, nici nu voiu aștepta….cine s'a înjosit în cochetării și lingușiri pe la Londra și Petersburg, ca Republica francesă? Dacă Francia nu ajută pe vecinii Italieni, cari le sînt folositori și de necessitate ca să țină cumpăna mai bine între Germania și Englitera, vor ajuta ei pe Români cari sînt departe de ei?'

part of the French Ambassador in Constantinople to prevent further suffering.[97] It was a dramatic step down from the addresses of summer.

The election of Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte as President of the French Republic in December only worsened the Wallachians' prospects in France. Maiorescu continued to advocate looking elsewhere for support. In a letter to Golescu in January 1849 he diagnosed one of the principle failings of Wallachian diplomacy during the summer. They had set too much stock in French influence in Constantinople when French domestic politics was so tumultuous. Only two powers were in a position to influence the Ottomans: Russia and Britain. They alone were 'unshaken by the modern earthquake' of revolution. But it wasn't just Maiorescu who doubted France's capacity to serve the Wallachian cause. Several revolutionaries were disillusioned by the course of French politics. C.A. Rosetti was one of the most ardent Francophiles among the Wallachians, but in April 1849 he told Ion Ghica that 'reaction reigns in France, and every day some liberty is compromised.'[98] The French assault on the Roman Republic that began the same month seemed to end any hope of France acting as a liberator. In a letter to Ghica on 26 May, the British agent in Bucharest Effingham Grant described Louis-Napoléon's policy towards Rome as 'inexplicable and enigmatic.' He could 'scarcely find the promises and hopes offered by the leaders of February to the Peoples of Europe.'[99]

The ideological order of February was supplanted by more strategic thinking from the autumn of 1848. Maiorescu's September proposal to the Frankfurt Parliament connected the fate of the Danubian Principalities with Italy. He was not the first person to suggest that Austria could be compensated for the creation of an Italian state by gaining territory in the Balkans. The Piedmontese Cesare Balbo had proposed a similar solution in 1844, and the French Foreign Minister Alphonse de Lamartine had contemplated an exchange of territory in the spring of 1848 to offer liberty to the Italians and create a strong buffer against the

---

[97] *Anul 1848,* V, 541-542. 'Le gouvernement valaque accepta avec résignation la position qui lui était faite, au nom de l'inflexible nécessité de la politique générale et laissa étouffer la révolution…Mais depuis lors, plusieurs milliers de citoyens ont été l'objet des persécutions de la Russie…Quelques paroles énergiques, prononcées par les représentants de France et d'Angleterre à Constantinople, préviendront facilement le nouveau malheur qui menace de fondre sur les Principautés.'

[98] Marin Bucur ed., *Corespondență C.A. Rosetti: ediție îngrijită, prefață, note și comentarii*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1980). 'în Franța domnește reacția și… pe toată ziua comprimă cîte-o libertate…'

[99] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 26 May 1849. BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s7(39)/DCXVI. '…la Politique de la République de Louis-Napoléon dans cette expédition (dite) manquée est aussi in-explicable et énigmatique que beaucoup de ses actes qui ont précédés cette intervention, et certes, on n'y retrouve guère les promesses et espérances offertes par ses chefs des jours de Février envers les Peuples de l'Europe.'

Russians in the East.[100] Maiorescu's proposal was the first project for Romanian unification by a member of the revolutionary generation. He suggested that Austria could unite the Bukovina, Transylvania, Moldavia, and Wallachia into a Romanian Kingdom with an Austrian prince and under German suzerainty. The population figures he provided to the Frankfurt Parliament in his memorandum even included the province of Bessarabia, which had been part of the Russian Empire since 1812. He connected his proposal to the events of February and March, which had 'shaken the world and promised a total reform of the social life of the people,' but he grounded his arguments in geopolitics rather than ideology. The exchange of Moldavia and Wallachia for Italian independence, he suggested, would 'unite the interests of Germany with those of the Principalities.'[101] Maiorescu doubted any European government would aid the Wallachians out of a sense of brotherhood. He told A.G. Golescu in a letter of 31 October that the Germans were not more humane than the French. 'Egoism,' he wrote, 'is the same everywhere,' but he believed that the German states had a greater political interest in reinforcing the anti-Slav elements of the South Danube than the French did. 'If we think about interests,' he told Golescu, 'then you'd be better off going to England to serve our cause than staying in France.'[102]

Britain had economic interests in the South Danube region, and the Wallachian exiles appealed to those interests in their requests for support. Trade between Britain and the two Danubian Principalities had grown since the Treaty of Adrianople abolished the Ottoman monopoly in 1829, and the ports of Brăila and Galați soon rivalled Odessa for a share of the European grain market. More than half of the maize exported from the Moldavian port of Galați in 1847 went to Britain, and the figures for Brăila were similar.[103] Agricultural goods constituted seventy-five percent of Russian exports during this period, and sixty-two percent of the grain it exported passed through Odessa, meaning that the challenge of the Danubian

---

[100] On Balbo, see Hearder, *Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento,* 197-198; On Lamartine, see Jennings, *France and Europe,* 218.

[101] BNR, Fond Brătianu VI/2, 4r & 10r. The German edition of Maiorescu's Memorandum was also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 414-420. 'evenimentele din februarie și marție cutremurară lumea și promisară o totală reformare a stării sociale a populilor… uneste interesele germaniei cu alle principatelor'/'Als die Februar- und März-Ereignisse dieses Jahres die Welt erschütterten, und eine gänzliche Umgestaltung der gesellschaftlichen Zustände der Völker verhiessen... den Interessen Deutschlands mit jenen der Fürstenthümer übereinstimmenden Weg leicht finden''

[102] *Anul 1848,* V, 218. 'egoismul este pretutindenea tot acela… Din punctual interesului mai curînd ai fi tras pe Englesi în partea noastră, decât pe Francesi'

[103] On British trade interests in the Danubian Principalities during this period, see the work of Constantin Ardeleanu. Constantin Ardeleanu, 'A British Meat Cannery in Moldavia (1844-1852)', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 90 (2012), 671-704; Constantin Ardeleanu, 'Danube Navigation and the Danube-Black Sea Canal (1830-1856)', *Revista Istorică*, XXIII (2012), 415-431; Ardeleanu, *International Trade and Diplomacy at the Lower Danube,* esp. 95-130 and 133-252 on the Sulina Channel, which is also discussed in Florescu, *Struggle Against Russia,* 273-301.

Principalities was a serious issue for Russian interests.[104] A prohibition on the export of foodstuffs was introduced in the two principalities by the counterrevolutionary regime in late 1848. The measure brought immediate protest on the part of the consuls in Bucharest, and none was more vociferous than R.G. Colquhoun. Some sixty to eighty British ships exported goods from the Danubian ports, and the majority dealt in grain and tallow from Brăila.[105] Contracts had already been drawn up, and the consequences for British merchants would be disastrous if they were unable to meet them.[106] The restrictions were lifted before the end of the year, but new tariffs and duties threatened the fledgling commerce of the region. Dumitru Brătianu highlighted these punitive measures in his *Documents concerning the Question of the Danubian Principalities* of 1849, which was 'dedicated' to the British Parliament. 'Those merchants who would deal with the Principalities,' he wrote, 'would have to pay eighteen per cent more than what they pay in Russia.' If restrictions were lifted, then the two principalities could become a vital resource of British commerce. He advised Parliament that there was enough free land in Moldavia and Wallachia for millions of colonists and the soil was of a good enough quality that the principalities could provide Britain with a 'rich store-house.' If trade were promoted, then they could also offer a thriving market for British manufacturing as there was little native secondary industry. British capital could fund roads, canals, and railways, establish manufactures, and even open the rich veins of silver, gold, copper, and quicksilver that lay beneath the Carpathian Mountains. Russia was trying to restrict British access to the Danubian Principalities to establish its own hegemony in the region's commerce. Untold opportunities would be available to Great Britain if the Russian occupation were ended.[107]

Russia's threat to European peace and stability was at the heart of Wallachian exile politics. Maiorescu submitted a second memorandum to the Frankfurt Parliament on 16 November, one week after Robert Blum was executed by firing squad outside Vienna. His first memorandum had begun with a discussion of the Wallachian Revolution in June. His second opened with the Eastern Question and the dangers of pan-Slavism, and it turned to one of the dominant themes of Wallachian and Moldavian historiography from the pre-revolutionary period: the principalities as a bulwark against an Eastern threat.[108] Pan-Slavism had supplanted the Ottoman Empire as the greatest danger to European liberty and

[104] Boris Ananich, 'The Russian economy and banking system', in Dominic Lieven ed., *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume II: Imperial Russia, 1689-1917*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 394-426, 400.
[105] BAR, Mss Rom 3834, 73r.
[106] BAR, Mss Rom 3834, 138.
[107] Bratiano, *Question of the Danubian Principalities*, 16-17.
[108] See chapter 1 on historiography.

civilisation, and only the Romanians and the Hungarians were suited to 'erecting a strong and lasting bastion' against it.[109] A Constantinople correspondent for *Le National* in France warned in November that the Tsar was fortified by 'the inconceivable apathy of Europe' over the Danubian Principalities, and that he proceeded 'at his pleasure.'[110] An article that appeared in London's *Morning Herald* on 14 December spelled out the danger the continent faced. Its anonymous Wallachian author wrote of the 'imminent danger which the world would incur should a formidable power become mistress at once of the Bosphorus and the Danube.' He foresaw the lighting of a train of gunpowder laid from the Urals to the Pyrenees. 'To put a stop to the conflagration,' he wrote, 'it will perhaps be necessary to demolish more than one empire…a terrific darkness will overspread Europe.'[111] Dumitru Brătianu made a similar point in his address to the British Parliament. In a prefatory address to its members, he wrote that the cause which he brought them was 'closely connected with the dignity of Great Britain, her commerce, and the peace of Europe.' Russia had been allowed to exercise an 'uncontrolled' and 'tyrannical influence' over the Ottoman Porte, and he warned that their forces would not stop at Wallachia.[112] The Polish exiles and their allies had argued that the Polish cause was 'inseparable from that of Europe' during the 1830s, and the post-revolutionary Wallachian exiles adopted the same argument. The 'question' of the Danubian Principalities was not just a matter for Moldavia and Wallachia. It touched upon the entire edifice of Europe.

The future of the Danubian Principalities was connected to the cause of other small national communities. These were often discussed in the context of Russia and Europe. In his address to the British Parliament, Dumitru Brătianu suggested that Wallachia, Moldavia, and Serbia would all side with the Ottomans in any future conflict with Russia. Between them they could supply 100,000 soldiers, who would 'combat as men do who fight for their independence,' and the struggle would be taken up by the Circassians in the Caucasus, too. The Circassian cause had been adopted by the British diplomat, journalist, and politician David Urquhart during the 1830s after he visited the region during a stint with the British mission in Constantinople. He believed the Circassians could check the threat of Russia to Britain's interests in the Middle East, but it wasn't just British politicians who took a strategic

[109] BNR, Fond Brătianu VI/2, 11-16 (Romanian)/22-30 (German). German also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 361-369. 'Magiarii si românii orientali sunt apti spre a intemeia un bastion tare si permanent în contra panslavismului/'die Magyaren und die Ostromanen zur Aufrichtung eines starken und dauarhaften Bollwerkes gegen den Panslavismus, im interesse der Freiheid und der Civilisation.'
[110] *Anul 1848,* V, 419. 'Le czar est fort de l'inconcevable apathie de l'Europe, et ne procède dans les principautés qu'en vertu de son bon plaisir.'
[111] *Anul 1848,* V, 569-571.
[112] Bratiano, *Question of the Danubian Principalities*, 4 & 15.

interest in the Circassian cause.[113] The Polish Prince Adam Czartoryski did, too. He sent a Polish mission to the region in 1835, and he maintained lifelong links to the rebels.[114] Brătianu foresaw that they too would rise and attack Russia if the opportunity arose, and it would not be long before the Bessarabians and the peoples of 'all the southern as well as German provinces of Russia' took arms to regain their liberty. 'In short,' he wrote, 'Russia would be pursued by the hate of all the nations of Europe, which has no equal save the Muscovite barbarity which has caused it.'[115]

Attempts were made to establish alliances with other exile communities and national revolutionary movements, and talk of confederation was entertained. The interconnectivities of national causes had long been recognised by European liberals and radicals. Giuseppe Mazzini's 'Young Europe' movement had brought together Italian revolutionaries with German, Swiss, and others, and many of the Polish exiles after 1831 hoped for a world revolution that could facilitate Polish liberation. The year 1848 offered hope to such beliefs. Adam Czartoryski wrote on 7 March that 'the sky is clearing up over us,' and many Polish exiles volunteered to serve other national causes. Polish officers enrolled in the Sardinian and Papal armies, and Michał Czajkowski travelled from Paris to Constantinople where he was in regular contact with Ion Ghica. He even provided advice on how to organise a Wallachian army.[116] Contact wasn't just made between Poland and other national revolutionary causes either. The would-be Wallachian revolutionaries had held discussions with their Hungarian neighbours in April and May of 1848. Dumitru Brătianu had travelled with the French agent and Hungarian national Louis Mandl to Pest in May, and he discussed the possibility of a Polish-Hungarian-Romanian confederation with Prime Minister Lajos Batthyány, but Batthyány said he would do nothing until a French army arrived. Several prominent Transylvanian Romanians had supported Hungarian policy during the Springtime of Peoples. Avram Iancu and Alexandru Papiu-Ilarian both signed a March petition to the Habsburg Emperor in favour of a Magyar programme, and Timotei Cipariu and George Barițˌ believed that the Hungarian attachment to liberalism was genuine.[117] But in the same

[113] On Urquhart and Circassia, see Charles King, 'Imagining Circassia: David Urquhart and the Making of North Caucasus Nationalism', *The Russian Review* 66 (2007), 238-255.
[114] Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity,* 235-236.
[115] Bratiano, *Question of the Danubian Principalities,* 18.
[116] On Czartoryski's Polish circle in 1848, see Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity,* 251-276; for an example of Czajkowski's correspondence with Ghica, see *Anul 1848,* II, 92. Ghica repeatedly testified to the importance of his help. See, for instance, *Anul 1848,* II, 413 & 716. And for Czajkowski's advice on the organisation of a Wallachian army, see *Anul 1848,* III, 115-117.
[117] Keith Hitchins, *The Rumanian national movement in Transylvania, 1780-1849*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1969), 185-189.

month that Batthyány met Brătianu, Lajos Kossuth sent a messenger to Paris and London to seek an alliance against the twin causes of pan-Slavism and Daco-Romanianism. Talk of alliance petered out during summer, and a Hungarian government pamphlet in July urged Transylvania's Saxon population to help 'preserve our Hungarian-German Transylvania' against the threat of irredentist Romanian plotting.[118] The attitude of the Hungarian population of Transylvania was summed up by the English agriculturalist John Paget, who kept a diary of events during 1848 and 1849. In an entry from June 1849 he wrote that the Russians 'will be looked on as saviours if they save the town [of Klausenberg, or Cluj] from the Wallachs.'[119] Nicolae Bălcescu was the strongest advocate of a Hungarian-Romanian alliance. He attempted to negotiate with Kossuth during the first months of his exile, but he was soon disaffected. He wrote to Ion Ghica from Belgrade in December 1848 and lamented the effect that national differences had had in Transylvania. 'The war between the Hungarians and the Romanians,' he wrote, 'is a barbarous one.'[120] His attempts to broker a peace between the Hungarians and the forces of Avram Iancu, whose position on the Hungarian Revolution had changed since March, failed.[121] The possibility of a confederation of the smaller states of Central and Southeastern Europe was resurrected in the early 1850s. Dumitru Brătianu took part in discussions in London for a Danubian Confederation organised under the aegis of Giuseppe Mazzini's European Revolutionary Committee in 1851, and Bălcescu wrote to the Hungarian Émigré Committee in Paris to propose a federation modelled on Switzerland in February of the same year.[122] None of these discussions succeeded, but the willingness of revolutionary exiles to contemplate multinational states suggests that their efforts to turn national questions into European ones were not entirely cynical. The French novelist and politician Victor Hugo was not alone when he imagined a future United States of Europe in his opening remarks to the International Congress on Peace in 1849.[123] In a letter to C.A. Rosetti in March 1850, Ion Ghica wrote that 'only a system of united states of Europe on the model of the United States of America

---

[118] Apostol Stan, 'Lajos Kossuth and the Romanians during the 1848 Revolution', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXIII (1994), 355-374, 362; Hitchins, *Rumanian national movement in Transylvania*, 237.
[119] Miller Madden ed., 'Diary of John Paget, 1849', 244.
[120] Bălcescu to Ghica, 28 December 1848. Reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere,* IV, 119. 'Războiul între unguri și români este un război barbar.'
[121] See Gelu Neamțu, 'Maghiari alături de revoluția română de la 1848-1849 din Transilvania', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițiu din Cluj-Napoca* XLI (2002), 97-126.
[122] On discussions in London, see Jianu, *Circle of Friends,* 189-196; for Bălcescu's letter, see Bălcescu to the Committee of Magyar Emigration in Paris, February 1851. Reprod. in Bălcescu, *Opere,* IV, 359-362; On discussions between Hungarians and Romanians in exile, see Ambrus Miskolczy, 'The Dialogue among Hungarian and Romanian Exiles in 1850-1851', in Ignác Romsics & Béla K. Király eds., *Geopolitics in the Danube Region: Hungarian Reconciliation Efforts, 1848-1998,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1999), 99-129.
[123] Victor Hugo, *Actes et Paroles: Avant l'Exil,* (Paris, 1875), 3 vols, vol I, 379-389.

will allow Europe to escape shipwreck.'[124] Talks of confederation among the smaller nationalities represented miniature versions of this idea. The defeat of the Wallachian and Hungarian Revolutions in 1848 and 1849 had made clear that small states were not viable in a Europe dominated by Great Powers and Empire. Confederation promised strength in numbers.

A network of friends, allies, politicians, and journalists aided the Wallachian exiles and promoted their cause in parliaments and the court of public opinion. Articles and pamphlets were published and correspondence maintained. Promoters of the Wallachian cause had broad liberal interests, and they were often engaged with other national causes, suggesting that national liberation was a general rather than specific interest. In Britain, Dumitru Brătianu maintained a correspondence with the British Member of Parliament Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart. He published several of their letters from 1853 as a pamphlet in 1858 during negotiations about the future of the two principalities. In the first letter, dated 20 March, Brătianu wrote that he had chosen to contact Stuart because of his 'courageous and incessant efforts on behalf of Poland, Italy, Roumania, and Hungary' which had made him 'the official intermediary between free England, and the peoples who aspire to become like her.'[125] Stuart was well known to the Polish circle of Adam Czartoryski, and in December of the same year that he corresponded with Brătianu, he appeared in Constantinople with letters of introduction from the Polish prince. He was there as Czartoryski's extraordinary envoy.[126] In France, the Wallachians turned to old allies and friends associated with Jules Michelet, Edgar Quinet, and the Collège de France. Félix Colson, Saint-Marc Girardin, and Jean Alexandre Vaillant had all published pamphlets and articles on the two Danubian Principalities during the 1830s, and they were joined by others after the revolution fell.[127] These men had broad liberal interests. Paul Bataillard was one of Edgar Quinet's former students. He maintained a correspondence with the Chilean revolutionary Francisco Bilbao, and he gathered material on the history of the Roma in Europe and Algeria and wrote several works of his own on the subject.[128] Élias Régnault was another ally with catholic interests. He was placed in charge of

---

[124] Ion Ghica to C.A. Rosetti, 12/24 March 1850. Reprod. in Ion Ghica, Ion Roman ed., *Opere*, (Bucharest: Ed. Minerva, 1967-1988), 6 vols, vol VI, 149-155. 'Numai sistemul de staturi unite ale Europii după modelul Statelor Unite ale Americii putea scăpa Europa de naufragiu.' I am grateful to Susanne Schmidt for providing me with photographs of this letter.

[125] D. Bratiano, *Wallachia and Moldavia: Correspondence of D. Bratiano with Lord Dudley C. Stuart, M.P. on the Danubian Principalities in 1853,* (Manchester: A. Ireland & Co, 1858), 4.

[126] Stuart died during this mission. See Kukiel, *Czartoryski and European Unity,* 281-293.

[127] On Colson, Girardin, and Vaillant, see Nicolae Isar, *Publiciști francezi și cauza română*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1991).

[128] On Bataillard's relationship with Quinet, see Olimpiu Boïtos, 'Paul Bataillard, un ami oublié d'Edgar Quinet : Quelques lettres inédites de Quinet', *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 39 (1932), 204-235; Some of

French prisons during Cavaignac's Ministry in May 1848, and he was a prolific writer of histories after 1848.[129] His works included a three-volume history of the years 1840-1848 in France, a history of the French Provisional Government of 1848, a history of the Antilles and French colonies published in 1849, and in 1863 he would go on to publish a book on *La Question Européenne, improprement appelée Polonaise.*[130] Armand Lévy was a close friend of Mickiewicz's, and he—like Bataillard and Regnault—was involved in the French Revolution of 1848. All three of these men wrote tracts and books in support of the Danubian Principalities, and they played a vital role in disseminating the ideas of the revolutionary exiles to the broader reading public. Regnault published his *Histoire Politique et Sociale des Principautés Danubiennes* in 1855, and it was cited by Karl Marx as a source for his *Das Kapital.*[131] The activities of these French publicists would ramp up from 1845 onwards, and they were particularly active during the Congress of Paris that settled the Crimean War. Armand Lévy and Ion Brătianu even teamed up to write a pamphlet in 1858 on behalf of Emperor Louis-Napoléon himself. It marked a dramatic change of fortune for Brătianu in France. He had been arrested five years earlier on suspicion of participating in the 'Hippodrome Affair,' which was a plot to assassinate Louis-Napoléon.[132] All of this work was intended to support diplomatic activity, and it too borrowed from the Polish model of the 1830s and 1840s that had developed under the leadership of their friend Adam Czartoryski. As Holly Case has noted, influencing public opinion for the Polish was 'comparable to or effectively *a form of* diplomacy.'[133] The articles and pamphlets written by the Wallachian exiles and their allies served the same purpose. During the revolution they had grounded

---

Bataillard's correspondence with Bilbao can be found at ANIC, Paul Bataillard Fond Personal, 1217; Bataillard's library of material on the Roma was purchased by Manchester Libraries Committee in 1895. See *Manchester Guardian,* 9 October 1895.

[129] Regnault's name appears as 'Chef de division' of Prisons at A. Fouquier, *Annuaire Historique Universel, ou Histoire Politique pour 1848 avec un appendice contenant les actes publics, traités, notes diplomatiques, tableaux statistiques financiers, administratifs et judiciaires, documents historiques officiels et non officiels, et un article Variétés renfermant des chroniques des événements les plus remarquables, des travaux publics, des lettres, des sciences et des arts, et des notices bibliographiques et nécrologiques,* (Paris, 1848), 84.

[130] Élias Regnault, *La Question Européenne improprement appelée Polonaise. Réponse aux objections présentées par Mm. Pogodine, Schédo-Ferroti, Porochine, Schnitzler, Solowiew, etc. contre le Polonisme des Provinces Lithuano-Ruthènes et contre le non-Slavisme des Moscovites,* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1863).

[131] Élias Regnault, *Histoire Politique et Sociale des Principautés Danubiennes*; for Marx's citation of Regnault, see Marx, *Capital,* I, 348. Regnault's title was misleading. His book didn't only concern the two principalities. There were chapters on Transylvania, too.

[132] See [Ion Brătianu and Armand Lévy], *L'Empereur Napoléon III et Les Principautés Roumains,* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1858). The pamphlet was published anonymously, but Brătianu and Lévy's authorship is mentioned in Alfréd Darimon, *Histoire d'un Parti. Les Cinq sous l'Empire, 1857-1860,* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1885), 196; On Brătianu's involvement in the Hippodrome Affair, see Jianu, *Circle of Friends,* 242-252; on French pamphleteers around the Congress of Paris specifically, see Natalie Isser, *The Second Empire and the Press: A Study of Government-inspired Brochures on French Foreign Policy in their Propaganda Milieu,* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974), 41-64.

[133] Case, *Age of Questions,* 47.

Wallachian foreign policy in the will of the Wallachian people. In the decade afterwards they turned their attention to foreign publics too, and 'world public opinion' would continue to be an important subject for Romanian diplomacy into the twentieth century.[134]

The geopolitical complexity of Europe during the revolutionary year had hindered the work of the Wallachian government's foreign envoys, but the Crimean War turned Europe's attention to Southeastern Europe. Most European states were preoccupied with their own internal politics during the summer of 1848, and when governments cast their eyes towards foreign problems they prioritised the Italian Peninsula over the Danubian Principalities. Wallachia's envoys were fixated upon the unifying message of the Springtime of Peoples, but while it still carried force in the streets, it had lost its appeal in the palaces and assemblies of Europe. Only Russia and the Ottoman Empire considered the Danubian Principalities a geopolitical priority, and the force of Wallachian public opinion did little to move the two powers. The joint occupation forced the revolutionaries into exile, and the experience led them to adopt a more strategic approach to diplomacy. They learnt from the Polish approach associated with their friend Adam Czartoryski, and they spoke to the Great Powers and other national communities of shared European interests rather than ideologies. But it was only the outbreak of the Crimean War that made those interests concrete. The outbreak of war owed something to the legacy of 1848. The Russian military commander and statesman Prince Alexander Sergeyevich Menshikov described Tsar Nicholas I as 'drunk with success' after the suppression of the revolutionary movements in Hungary and Wallachia. He considered Russia an irresistible power, and he believed that his support for the Austrians would mean that they sided with Russia against the Ottoman, French, British, and Sardinian forces, but Austria remained neutral, and Russia was defeated.[135] A new geopolitical order had emerged in the South Danube region, and in 1859 the Wallachian and Moldavian assemblies would elect the same man as prince: Alexandru Ioan Cuza.[136] The union of the two principalities had not been an urgent matter for the Wallachian revolutionaries during the summer of 1848, but it became a question of exile politics after the Ottoman invasion. Alternatives were discussed, and unification was not the only possible outcome of Wallachian diplomatic activity between 1848 and 1859. It was just the one that happened.

[134] See Case, *Between States,* 9-66.
[135] Roberts, *Nicholas I and the Russian Intervention in Hungary,* 224-226.
[136] On the Crimean War and the Union of Moldavia and Wallachia, see Hitchins, *Romanians,* 273-317.

V. The Counterrevolutionary Order

The counterrevolution in Wallachia was part of an international effort by conservative imperial forces to regain their European dominance. The links between revolutionary movements and causes during the spring of 1848 have been well studied by historians, but the connections between counterrevolutionary fronts have often been underestimated. Jonathan Sperber doubted the European relevance of the counterrevolution in Moldavia and Wallachia. It had 'nowhere near the broader impact of the Parisian June Days or the victories of General Radetzky.'[1] His assessment ignores the link between the suppression of the Wallachian Revolution and the Hungarian one, which has often been misunderstood. Adrian Brisku wrote that the Russian intervention in Hungary made intervention in Wallachia and Moldavia 'possible.'[2] His narrative of events was likely the result of a misreading of Stanford Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw's *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey,* in which the two historians wrote that Tsar Nicholas' forces suppressed the Wallachian Revolution 'as they marched against the Hungarian revolutionaries.'[3] This description is also inadequate. Russian forces entered Wallachia in October 1848. They moved against the Hungarians in the spring and summer of 1849. Intervention in Wallachia facilitated the attack on Transylvania, and it provided a path for Habsburg forces to outmanoeuvre their Hungarian enemies. As Barbara Jelavich has noted, the fall of the governments in Berlin and Vienna had weakened the Holy Alliance of Prussia, Austria, and Russia and left the Russian Empire exposed in Europe.[4] The defeat of the Wallachian Revolution made it possible for the Tsar to come to the aid of one of his allies. Revolution had fed revolution during the spring of 1848, and by the summer of 1849 counterrevolution supported counterrevolution.

But the intervention in Wallachia was also part of an inter-imperial struggle that pitted two competing approaches to counterrevolution against one another: repression versus reform. The two key players in this clash were the Russian General Alexander Duhamel and the Ottoman Commissar Fuad Effendi. They met for the first time in the morning of 28 August 1848 at the Moldavian port of Galaţi. Duhamel had arrived the previous evening. He found Fuad to be an agreeable man with a reasonable facility in French, which was perhaps an understatement. Fuad had entered the interpreters' office of the Ottoman government

[1] Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 225-226.
[2] Adrian Brisku, *Political Reform in the Ottoman and Russian Empires: A Comparative Approach,* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 99.
[3] Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire,* 136. Shaw & Shaw's description also misses the months between intervention in Wallachia in September 1848 and the move into Transylvania the following summer.
[4] Jelavich, 'Russian Intervention', 17-18.

during the 1830s after studying medicine, and he rose to the position of First Translator of the Porte in 1838.[5] He would go on to play a prominent role in the Tanzimat Reforms of the 1850s and 1860s, serving as Foreign Minister on several occasions and as Grand Vizier from 1861 to 1866. Duhamel thought him a little spineless and lacking in energy, 'like all the Turks of the new school.' After exchanging the usual pleasantries, their talk turned to the revolution in neighbouring Wallachia, which 'thanks to the faults of Suleiman Pasha,' wrote Duhamel in his account of the meeting for the Russian Foreign Minister Count Nesselrode, had 'acquired a great degree of severity and which needed to be resolved sooner rather than later.' Duhamel advocated severe measures. Fuad preached clemency.[6] Neither man changed his opinion over the following month, and three days after taking residence in Bucharest, Fuad wrote to Duhamel on 28 September to reiterate his point: leniency and the 'material improvement of the country' were the 'best guarantees of the reestablishment of good order.'[7] Duhamel protested. The men who had 'overthrown all the institutions of the country, turned its classes one against another, and set fire to the laws of the land' needed to be punished. Material improvement could wait. First the country needed to be 'purged of the elements of anarchy which it harboured.'[8] Fuad's first priority was to keep the Russians out of Wallachia. He needed to restore order to avoid giving any pretext for a joint occupation. But General Duhamel had accompanied Fuad's forces into Bucharest, and just as the two men disagreed about the best means to prevent a future insurrection, they were also at odds on the state of the principality. Fuad told Duhamel that he was 'perfectly capable of maintaining and

---

[5] For a brief—and contemporaneous—biographical note on Fuad, see the entry in *Men of the Time: A Dictionary of Contemporaries, containing biographical notices of Eminent Characters of Both Sexes,* London: Routledge and Sons, 1868), 7th edition, 331. See also Stanford J. Shaw & Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey Volume 2: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey 1808-1975,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 55-171.

[6] Account taken from Duhamel's report to Nesselrode of 31 August 1848, reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 250-254. 'J'ai trouvé dans le nouveau Commissaire de la Porte un homme s'exprimant avec assez de facilité en français, ayant des formes agréables, et paraissant avoir beaucoup d'aménité dans le caractère, mais en même temps il m'a semblé mou et sans énergie, comme tous les Turcs de la nouvelle école. Après les complimens [sic] d'usage, j'ai abordé la question Valaque. Vous devez reconnaître aussi bien que moi, lui aije [sic] dit, que cette question grâce aux fautes de Suleyman Pacha, a acquis un haut degré de gravité et qu'il est urgent d'en finir au plutôt…Je considère des mesures de répression et de sévérité comme indispensables, tandis que l'Amedji prêche la clémence et l'oubli du passé.'

[7] Fuad to Duhamel, 28 September 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 275-277. 'La clémence après la victoire, l'amélioration matérielle du pays, sont la plus sure garantie du rétablissement de l'ordre'

[8] Duhamel to Fuad, 29 September 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 279-280. '…si les individus, qui ont bouleversé toutes les institutions de leur pays, ameuté toutes les classes de la population les uns contre les autres, et finalement porté l'audace jusqu'à livrer aux flammes la loi du pays…étaient simplement expulsés hors du pays pour continuer à librement ourdir leurs intrigues à l'étranger un tel résultat, je ne le cache pas à V. Exc, ne pourra jamais rencontrer l'approbation du Cabinet IMPl, et qui plus est, laissera le pays en proie à une sourde agitation qui à la première occasion éclatera en révolte ouverte. Quand une fois le pays aura été purgé des élémens [sic] d'anarchie qu'il recèle, alors on pourra songer à la clémence envers les individus, qui n'ont été qu'égarés ; alors on pourra s'occuper d'améliorations matérielles.'

assuring the tranquillity of the city and order in the country.' There were already twelve thousand Ottoman soldiers in Bucharest. The addition of a Russian force would only bring further hardship.[9] Duhamel replied that neither man had received news from the provinces and that Bucharest 'resembles a volcano, always ready to erupt.' Russian military involvement would have a 'most beneficial moral effect.'[10] He wrote to Count Nesselrode on 30 September informing him that revolutionary agitation continued and the Ottomans could not be trusted to pacify the country. The back and forth between Fuad and Duhamel continued for several weeks until the Russian Fifth Army under General Alexander Nikolayevich Lüders crossed the Wallachian border.[11]

The clash between the two counterrevolutionary philosophies did not map neatly onto a Russian-Ottoman divide. As Barbara Jelavich has noted, Tsar Nicholas I might have opposed violent and radical change, but he approved of liberal political reform that was pursued through legal channels and introduced from above.[12] Count Pavel Kiselev had followed this approach in Moldavia and Wallachia between 1829 and 1834, and he recommended further reform in 1848 to curb the excesses of the boyars, eradicate corruption, and restore stability to the two principalities. Nor were the Ottomans above the use of violence to suppress resistance. Numerous accounts of the army's entrance into Bucharest on 25 September accused the Ottoman forces of brutality. Christian Tell wrote that Ottoman soldiers had plundered the neighbourhood of Isvor and dragged women and children into the streets and stripped and murdered them.[13] The French consul, Hory, sent similar reports to General Aupick in Constantinople. He informed him that the Turks had sacked Bucharest's suburbs, disembowelled women, children, and the elderly, and ransacked the home of a French citizen.[14] Fuad disputed these accusations. He told Hory that the conduct of his troops was 'so regular that all impartial persons must accord them due justice…their patience and

[9] Fuad to Duhamel, 28 September 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele ruseşti,* 276. '…je suis parfaitement en état de maintenir et d'assurer la tranquillité de la ville et l'ordre dans le pays'
[10] Duhamel to Fuad, 29 September 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele ruseşti,* 279. 'Nous manquons de nouvelles des provinces et la capitale ressemble à un volcan, toujours prêt à faire éruption…je suis persuadé que l'arrivée des troupes russes devant Bucarest produira un effet moral des plus salutaires.'
[11] For Fuad and Duhamel's correspondence as well as Duhamel's letters to Nesselrode, see Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele ruseşti,* 280-300.
[12] Jelavich, 'The Russian Intervention in Wallachia and Transylvania'.
[13] *Anul 1848,* IV, 348.
[14] For accounts of the Ottoman entrance to Bucharest, see Hory to Aupick, 26 September 1848. CAD, 166PO/E/168 and BAR, Mss Rom 3850, 16-17. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 341-344. See also the copies of the depositions of three of the firemen—Deivos, Zaganescu, and Pescara—at TNA, FO 78/743, 79-85.

their moderation was beyond all praise.'[15] A commission established to investigate the accusations cleared the Ottomans of any wrongdoing. It concluded that the stories of men trampled under the hooves of Ottoman horses, children with their throats cut, and disembowelled women were all false, and that the Ottoman soldiers had only fired upon the firemen on Spirea's Hill, who shot first.[16] The new police chief, Colonel Ion Voinescu I, supported this assessment. His own investigations discovered only a few instances of theft in the Isvor neighbourhood, and he wrote that these had happened after inhabitants abandoned their homes at the sound of gunshots. There was no telling who had looted their houses during the occupants' absence.[17] Both Hory and his British counterpart, Robert Colquhoun, had their doubts. Each man gathered eyewitness testimonies, and Colquhoun found it 'hard to conceive that a handful of men should have been so reckless of life as to fire upon a regular body of men furnished with all the appliances of war.'[18]

The objective of the counterrevolutionary forces was not simply to undo the work of the revolutionary summer. Most historians end their accounts of the Wallachian Revolution on 25 September. They dismiss the period that followed as witnessing only the 'restoration of the pre-revolutionary regime.'[19] Only Ioana Cristache-Panait has suggested that the investigations that followed the revolution should be considered as part of the revolution itself.[20] The Convention of Balta Liman of 1849 might have restored the pre-revolutionary political regime, under which Wallachian and Moldavian princes were nominated to seven-year terms by the Ottomans and approved by the Russians, but this was only one feature of the counterrevolutionary programme. Far more significant was the expansion of the bureaucratic apparatus of the state, which exercised controls that went beyond those of the pre-revolutionary period. Duhamel shared the conservative principles of the former Russian Finance Minister Georg von Kankrin and the Interior Minister Lev Alekseevich Perovskii, who both counselled Nicholas I against the expansion of the railways in Russia. Geographical

[15] Fuad Effendi to Hory, 27 September 1848. CAD, 166PO/E/168. 'La conduite des troupes Impériales depuis leur entrée en Valachie, a été si régulière que toutes les personnes impartiales doivent s'accorder à leur rendre justice…leur patience et leur modération a été au dessus de tout éloge.'
[16] BAR, Mss Rom 3850, 66.
[17] BAR, Mss Rom 3850, 75 (Romanian) & 83 (French translation).
[18] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 28 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 75r.
[19] Berindei, *Revoluția română,* 361. '…restatorniciea regimului anterior revoluției.' But see also Jelavich, 'Russian Intervention', 27. 'The old order was thus officially re-established.'
[20] Cristache-Panait, 'București după 13 septembrie 1848', 900. Beatrice Marinescu has also written about the post-revolutionary period. See Beatrice Marinescu. See Beatrice Marinescu, 'Evenimentele politice postrevoluționare din principatele române în perspectiva rapoartelor diplomatice engleze (1849-1953) ', *Revista Istorică*, IV (1993), 1015-1034.

mobility could make 'unstable people even more unstable.'[21] Contact with Europe had fuelled revolution in Wallachia during the summer, and new restrictions on the movement of goods, information, and people were introduced after 25 September to limit the spread of ideas and break the links between Wallachia and Europe. But not all measures to mitigate the possibility of a future insurrection were restrictive. The new government also introduced reforms to ameliorate the lives of the peasants. The events of the summer had exposed the cracks in the Wallachian social order, and the counterrevolutionary government set about finding ways to fill them.

Discipline

Effective counterrevolutionary government required order in Wallachia. Bucharest and the countryside needed to be brought under the control of the new regime, and revolutionary resistance had to be extirpated. The Ottoman authorities had subdued the capital on 25 September, but peasant unrest continued, and the revolutionary General Gheorghe Magheru maintained a force in the western region of Oltenia. Both posed threats to the Ottoman counterrevolutionary order. The Russian forces of General Lüders were stationed near the Wallachian border, and Fuad and Omer Pasha hoped to avoid a joint occupation. Soldiers were despatched to quell the disorder in the countryside, and the British consul Robert Colquhoun mediated the demobilisation of Magheru's forces. But the Russian authorities had settled on invasion, and between them the two occupying powers negotiated a new regulatory order for Wallachia. It extended the reach of the state and imposed new controls on movement to mitigate a future revolutionary outbreak. Some initiatives were meant to eliminate discontent among the people. Others were intended to check the spread of revolutionary politics. Information was at the heart of this work. The new government expanded the bureaucratic apparatus of the state and kept detailed records of its citizens, but at the same time it restricted public access to information, especially when it came from abroad. The revolutionaries had sought to Europeanise the principality. The new counterrevolutionary controls attempted to provincialise it.

The post-revolutionary government's first priority was to restore a sense of normality to the principality. On the same day that he entered Bucharest, Fuad Effendi addressed a

[21] Quoted in Houri Berberian, *Roving Revolutionaries: Armenians and the Connected Revolutions in the Russian, Iranian, and Ottoman Worlds,* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019), 88.

proclamation to the Wallachian people. He criticised the 'spirit of communism' that had triumphed across Europe and challenged the legal order in Wallachia, and he replaced the Princely Lieutenancy with a new Caimacamie, or Regency. The office fell to the prominent boyar Constantin Cantacuzino. Fuad concluded his remarks with specific addresses to the various classes of Wallachian society. He called on the boyars to return to their homes in the city, the priests to preach unity and obedience, the merchants and artisans to give proofs of their support for the legal order of the country, and the peasants to return to their labours in the fields. 'Leave it in the fatherly hands of your government's care,' he told the peasants, 'to ease your sufferings.'[22] The revolution had exposed popular grievances, but these needed to be dealt with through the proper legal channels. Anarchy had to be avoided.

Neither the Ottomans nor the revolutionary leaders wished to provide a pretext for a Russian occupation of Wallachia. Fuad was locked in conflict with General Duhamel in the early days of the counterrevolution. His orders were to restore legitimate government to Wallachia. The need to prevent the expansion of Russian influence in the principality was left unspoken, but it was an important objective for the Porte, and the restoration of order was a vital component of this geopolitical struggle. General Gheorghe Magheru and his army camped on the Field of Trajan in Vâlcea County posed the most obvious threat. Magheru had adopted a hostile posture towards the Ottoman invaders. In an address to the administrators of the nine counties of Oltenia he wrote that it was better to die than submit to the infamy of the new counterrevolutionary government, which had been imposed at the point of a bayonet, but his intermediaries also sought the advice of the British consul Robert Colquhoun.[23] Colquhoun advised him not to resist the Ottoman occupation. It would not only prove fatal for Magheru himself, but also for those around him, and it would bring great harm to the principality as a whole. Colquhoun recommended he lay down his arms, send his soldiers home, and flee across the border.[24] Magheru took his advice. He disbanded his forces on 10 October. He thanked them for their devotion and discipline, but said that continued resistance would lead to a Russian occupation, which would devastate the principality.[25] Magheru's decision couldn't prevent the Russian invasion. Lüders had his orders from the Tsar, and rumours were already circulating that Russian soldiers had set foot on Wallachian soil. One of Colquhoun's agents reported that he had encountered some five thousand

[22] BAR, Mss Rom 3860, 357. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 319-321. '…și lăsați în părinteștile mâini ale guvernului vostru grija, de a ușura suferințele voastre.'
[23] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 285. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 479-480.
[24] Colquhoun to Magheru, 8 October 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 133-134.
[25] BAR, Mss Rom 3904, 315. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 576-577.

soldiers on his journey from Brăila to Bucharest. Three hundred of those men entered Bucharest four days after Magheru gave up the defence of the revolutionary cause.[26]

Magheru's army was not the only obstacle that the counterrevolutionary government faced, and ongoing unrest in the countryside challenged the counterrevolutionary state's attempts to impose order. Two days after Fuad addressed the Wallachian people on 25 September, the Russian General Lüders issued his own proclamation to the principality's inhabitants. His mission was to counteract 'the anarchy produced in your country by those factions that laid hands upon the reins of government.'[27] Fuad and Omer Pasha might have maintained that order had already been restored in their correspondence with General Duhamel, but privately both men knew that wasn't the case. Disorder was widespread, and peasants across the country refused to undertake their traditional labour obligations. Estates along the Danube were the worst affected. Landowner and tenant farmer requests for assistance inundated the new government into 1849.[28] The peasants of fifty-four of the 176 estates in Teleorman County refused to work the manorial reserve, and in Vlașca the figure was forty-one of 169 estates.[29] The peasants of Obilești and Oltenița Districts in Ilfov were described as 'seditious and disobedient,' and one Emanuil Florescu of Dâmbovița County reported eleven peasants of his estate for insubordination.[30] Many landowners and tenant farmers had faced peasant resistance during the summer too, but wandering propagandists, National guardsmen, and priests stoked the revolutionary fires after 25 September. The people of Alexandria in Teleorman County rose up on 30 September, and two days later the inhabitants of Pitești and its environs followed suit. They cried 'Long Live General Gheorghe Magheru.'[31] Shows of support for the revolutionary cause continued into the winter. A propaganda commissar, a priest, and two soldiers led two hundred peasants carrying weapons and tricolour flags through the streets of Craiova in mid-October, and the governor of Argeș County reported later that month that several priests and former electoral candidates from

[26] TNA, FO 78/743, 135r & 153r.
[27] A French translation of the proclamation can be found at TNA, FO 78/743, 113. A copy of the Romanian original can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3860, 360 and reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 369-370 '…l'anarchie produite dans votre pays par des factieux qui ont mis la main sur les rênes du gouvernement…'/ 'anarhia, produsă în țara voastră de facționarii, ce au pus măna pe frănele guvernului'
[28] For examples of cases from February 1849, see documents 271 & 272 in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 435-437.
[29] For the full figures, see Corfus, *Agricultura în Țările Române, 1848-1864*, 118-119.
[30] BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 60. '…duhurile lăcuitorilor satelor după linia dunări sînt cu totu răzvrătitoare și nesupusa.' See also BAR, Mss Rom 3860, 371. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 499-500; *Anul 1848,* V, 64.
[31] A. Stan, 'Încercări de organizare a unei rezistențe armate în timpul revoluției muntene de la 1848', *Studii*, 16 (1963), 621-642, 639-640. For the account of unrest in Alexandria, see BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 25-26. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 451-452. Stan cites the published account.

the villages were urging the peasants to ignore the new regime's orders.[32] The village of Runcu near the Olt River saw two hundred people take up armed resistance against the soldiers sent to pacify the village and confiscate weapons and revolutionary propaganda.[33] The Russian army had already entered the principality by this point, and Cossack assistance was needed to subdue the village. One hundred and fifty people were arrested. Only a few managed to escape.[34] November brought the discovery of a plot by several former members of the National guard, and a report from the tenant farmer of Macoveiu Estate in Buzău County suggests some priests continued to stir peasant disorder into January 1849.[35] All of these complaints needed to be dealt with through official channels. One Dimitrie Pața of Mehedinți County attempted to take matters into his own hands. He hired seven Ottoman soldiers to force the peasants of his estate to return to work without consulting local government. A report was made to the Interior Department of the principality, and Cantacuzino advised Fuad that his soldiers should direct all requests from landowners and tenant farmers to the local authorities.[36] The restoration of discipline was a matter for the state. Justice could not be exercised by private individuals.

Rural unrest carried serious consequences for the principality's food supply. The Princely Lieutenancy had issued a proclamation on 14 September calling on peasants to return to their ploughs and bring in the harvest.[37] To leave it to rot in the fields would bring great harm to the country, and Fuad shared the Princely Lieutenancy's concerns. He advised Constantin Cantacuzino on 7 October that the principality's prosperity depended upon the cultivation of the land. Neglecting the harvest would have terrible consequences for the material wellbeing of the country, and it could result in scarcity or famine. He considered it his duty to enlighten the peasants on the fatal consequences of their inaction, and if they wouldn't listen to his exhortations and counsels, then he would be 'forced to resort to severe measures.' He told Cantacuzino that in two or three days he would despatch columns of Ottoman soldiers to travel from village to village to enforce his directive and report back on the state of the countryside. Copies of his proclamation were to be printed and sent to local officials to read aloud in the villages. Peasants who continued to disobey would be severely

[32] BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 104; BAR, Mss Rom 3864, 3. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848*, V, 172.
[33] BAR, Mss Rom 3851, 114. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 205-206.
[34] BAR, Mss Rom 3851, 131. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 320-321.
[35] BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 319. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 301-302; BAR, Mss Rom 3851, 159. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 704.
[36] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 53. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 157-158.
[37] *Anul 1848,* IV, 172.

punished.[38] On 15 October, Cantacuzino recommended the Ottoman soldiers begin with the five counties that neighboured Bulgaria: Vlașca, Teleorman, Romanați, Dolj, and Mehedinți. He and his Interior Minister Ion Filipescu had not chosen these regions because they were the most rebellious. Reports from many parts of the country were yet to reach Bucharest. Instead they had prioritised the rich and fertile plains of Wallachia.[39] These were the principality's bread baskets.

Bread was a matter of public order for the new regime. Concerns over the food supply in both Moldavia and Wallachia had arisen during the summer. The Bucharest City Council struggled to agree a new contract with the city's butchers and bakers when the old agreement expired on 27 July, and poor quality bread and meat contributed to an outbreak of unrest in Brăila in early August.[40] The conservative government of Mihail Sturdza in neighbouring Moldavia was just as concerned about shortages and the threat they could pose to public order. A new baker's school at Iași opened in late August, and its first students were soldiers.[41] The issue grew more pressing in Wallachia with the arrival of the Ottoman and Russian armies. Temporary restrictions were placed on the export of cereals between October and December 1848, and the objections of the British and Sardinian consuls were ignored.[42] The British vice-consul in Brăila doubted the logic of these restrictions. In a letter to Robert Colquhoun of 27 October, he complained that the government 'seems to consider that cheap bread is a comfort to the poor and dear bread misery, without considering their means of purchasing that bread and whether they have employment.'[43] But Bucharest was the first priority. Fuad instructed Cantacuzino to take urgent measures to improve the quality of bread in the city and ensure it was sold at a fair price. Strict supervision was needed so that the poorest classes of the city could buy 'the first necessities of life at the cheapest possible price and in the best quality available.'[44] Professions connected to public subsistence were placed under the surveillance of the city police force, and bakers wishing to cease trading were required to give the government at least six months' notice.[45] Bakers who breached the

[38] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 7. '…Je me verrais forcé d'avoir recours a des mesures sévères…' ; BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 20. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 544.
[39] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 25.
[40] *Anul 1848,* II, 636-638 & 724-725. For more on the disturbance in Brăila, see chapter 3.
[41] Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu, *Patimă și Desfătare, Despre lucrurile mărunte ale vieții cotidiene în societatia românească (1750-1860)*, (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2015), 71-72.
[42] For the Wallachian Administrative Council's bulletin suspending exports, see BAR, Mss Rom 3834, 48. Foreign consul complaints can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3834, 48, 142, & 157-159.
[43] Cunningham to Colquhoun, 27 October 1848. TNA, FO 78/745, 275v.
[44] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 3. '…les premières nécessités de la vie au prix le plus bas possible et de la meilleur qualité' A Romanian edition can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3872, 159. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 515-516.
[45] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 78.

new government restrictions were punished with public humiliation and prison. On 15 October, a baker found selling short-weight loaves had his hands and feet chained and two of his loaves hung around his neck. The Bucharest police led him from market to market and then conveyed him to prison.[46] His crime wasn't unusual. Two days after his arrest, Fuad complained to Cantacuzino of the ongoing abuses of the bakers. He instructed the Caimacam to name a commission of 'honest and enlightened people' to find a solution. Fuad's personal secretary was sent as his representative.[47] The price of flour was fixed in December, and twelve bakers were brought over from Ruse in Bulgaria to deal with shortages in the Wallachian capital.[48]

The Bucharest government struggled to meet the city's needs, and bakers resented the new controls placed on their business. Fuad's commission filed its report in December. Two types of bread were sold in Bucharest at the time. One was a poor-quality white loaf and the other was a brown loaf that was richer and fresher. The commission recommended replacing these two loaves with a single style made from a mixture of equal parts of the three types of flour available in the marketplace. It would be sold at 14 piastres for a 1.25 kilogram loaf.[49] Cantacuzino informed Fuad of the recommendation on 31 December, but he said that it was impossible to implement the new system before 1 April because the municipality lacked the necessary stores of grain.[50] Fuad criticised the municipality's improvidence, but he accepted the delay provided the city exercise stricter supervision on the quality of bread and imposed tougher sanctions on bakers found guilty of fraud.[51] Three bakers from the Saint Visarion neighbourhood were found selling poor quality bread in January, and they were turned over to the Interior Department to administer punishment: fifty lashes across the back.[52] Bakers were understandably hostile to the government's measures. The Greek consul complained in early February. Several of his subjects were bakers, and it was unacceptable for them to be subjected to corporal punishment. The practice had been replaced by a fine during the reign of Prince Alexandru II Ghica in the 1830s, and the fifteen Greek bakers of the city would sooner give up the profession than submit to be beaten.[53] Cantacuzino's response was unequivocal. There could be no exceptions to the new regulations.[54] But problems continued.

[46] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 15 October 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 165v.
[47] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 6.
[48] TNA, FO 78/789, 81.
[49] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 33-34.
[50] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 51.
[51] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 49.
[52] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 57.
[53] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 76.
[54] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 78.

An exasperated Fuad complained to Cantacuzino on 27 February that the bread supplied to his soldiers by the city's bakers was of an extremely poor quality. He requested the use of an oven so that the Ottoman army could bake its own loaves.[55] April did not bring the relief that Cantacuzino had promised. The only suitable place to store the necessary quantities of grain in the city had been commandeered by the Russians, and the municipality lacked the funds to purchase the more than two thousand kilograms of wheat that would be needed to feed the city.[56] The Russian intervention in Transylvania exacerbated food shortages during the summer of 1849. Robert Colquhoun reported to Lord Palmerston on 23 July that large quantities of corn and other cereals were being bought up by the Russian army to provision its forces in Transylvania, and the price of barley had risen from fifty to 128 piastres.[57] Two weeks later he estimated that four thousand wagons of food had crossed the border.[58] The new Prince, Barbu Știrbei, made additional funds available to the Bucharest City Council in the same month, but it still struggled to meet its financial demands into the autumn of 1849. On 13 October it requested the repayment of 14,479 lei that had been spent on the celebrations for Ramadan in August. The money was needed to buy grain for the capital.[59]

Tighter government controls were also introduced for the possession and sale of weapons. An order was given on 27 September for all the citizens of Bucharest to give up their weapons to the city police, and the order was extended across the rest of the country on 6 October.[60] Local governors were instructed to keep lists of all confiscated weapons along with the names of their owners, and these were to be conveyed to the Interior Department.[61] A dedicated apparatus was established on 5 November to carry out the work.[62] All persons, both foreign and native, were required to relinquish their weapons to new commissions in each county, and merchants who sold gunpowder were obliged to give that up, too. Receipts would be issued in return detailing the number and quality of weapons surrendered. Any person found in possession of a weapon after 27 November in Bucharest or 13 December in the rest of the country would be punished with either a fine of five hundred lei or fifteen days in prison. A second offence would see the penalty doubled, and a third would lead to banishment.[63] Consular agents objected to these new laws. The Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca

[55] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 79.
[56] BAR, Mss Rom 3896, 96-97 & 103.
[57] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 23 July 1849. TNA, FO 78/788, 131r.
[58] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 7 August 1849. TNA, FO 78/788, 141v.
[59] BAR, Mss Rom 3898, 62.
[60] *Anul 1848,* IV, 369.
[61] BAR, Mss Rom 3865, 6-7. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 501-502.
[62] BAR, Mss Rom 3854, 38. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 260-261.
[63] BAR, Mss Rom 3854, 44. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 275-276.

had introduced a new category of personhood in 1774: the *sudit.* A *sudit* was a foreign imperial subject who enjoyed privileges in the Ottoman Empire, including extraterritoriality.[64] The Greek, Prussian, and British consuls all reminded the Wallachian Foreign Secretary of the special status of their subjects. It was a breach of international law to demand they entrust their possessions to local Wallachian officials, and so foreigners were permitted to deposit their weapons in the chancelleries of their consular representatives instead.[65]

Native Wallachians also sought exemptions to the new restrictions on the ownership of weapons, and their requests were framed in terms of private needs and public duty. Both the Prussian and the British consuls had raised concerns about the dangers their subjects would face if they were disarmed, and many landowners and merchants shared those worries. The governor of Dolj forwarded three petitions from the boyars and merchants of Craiova to central government in November. They didn't dare go out into the countryside to visit their estates or travel from town to town unarmed. There were too many wrongdoers lurking in the shadows, and the peasants were yet to be fully reconciled to the new state of affairs, making travel even more dangerous.[66] Nine landowners from Romanați County protested that the measure would be counterproductive. Landowners were the greatest obstacle to the progress of revolutionary insurgency and so should be exempted from the new laws. They would provide a model of tranquillity and public submission. The government had nothing to fear from landowners, and the landowners had everything to fear from robbers and revolutionaries. They would submit to the general disarmament if the government insisted, but it would be better to exempt them.[67]

The government was sensitive to requests for exemptions from respectable people, and in granting them it extended state control over the ownership of weapons. Those wishing to carry arms were required to prove a genuine need and seek government approval. Retired soldiers had the right to carry a sabre when dressed in their old uniforms, but other weapons had to be deposited with the commissions overseeing disarmament.[68] Tenant farmers were allowed to keep three or four firearms under the surety of their landlords, boyars and merchants could carry either a rifle or a pair of pistols when travelling to defend themselves

[64] Many *sudiți* were actually native Wallachians who had acquired foreign protection. See Giurescu, *Originilor și dezvoltării burgheziei române pînă la 1848*, 203-216 and Hitchins, *Romanians,* 69-70.
[65] For consular complaints, see BAR, Mss Rom 3835, 73-76.
[66] BAR, Mss Rom 3854, 181. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 360-361.
[67] BAR, Mss Rom 3854, 313-314. Romanian version reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 473-474.
[68] BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 35. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 559.

against evildoers, and exemptions were granted to hunters, too.[69] All of these people had to submit requests, and they were passed up the chain of command to the Interior Department. The Ottoman Military Commander Omer Pasha gave personal guarantees for eleven hunters, but even their cases were subject to the Interior Department's oversight.[70] State employees also required the proper permissions. The director of Wallachia's salt mines wrote to the Interior Department on 30 November requesting his employees be exempt from the general disarmament. He had sought dispensation from the governor of Vâlcea County, but the governor advised him that he lacked the authority to grant it, and the director would have to go through the county commission.[71] State couriers needed licences too, and the Secretariat of State had to provide the names of its soldiers before they were given permission to carry weapons on duty. Each was to be allowed two pistols, a sabre, a rifle, 'and nothing more.'[72] Records of exemptions were kept in local government offices, and copies were filed with the Interior Department.[73] In March 1849, for instance, the governor of Brăila County sent a series of documents to Bucharest giving the names and places of residence of all boyars, landowners, tenant farmers, and even gendarmes who were permitted to carry weapons within the county.[74] Suspicions remained that not all weapons were reported or handed over to the commissions, and investigations continued after the official deadline had passed.[75] The governor of Vâlcea County, for instance, reported in early March 1849 that his agent in Horezu District had found twenty-seven lances in two houses in the village of Folești-de-Sus.[76] But while there were definite attempts to evade legal oversight, the new system of controls on the ownership of weapons far exceeded anything from the pre-revolutionary period, and it demonstrated the increased sophistication of the state's bureaucratic apparatus. The controls remained in effect into the 1850s. Merchants wishing to sell arms had to register with the government and abide by a set of rules and regulations. The Austrian Carl Klar first sought

[69] BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 87. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 593-594; BAR, Mss Rom 3854, 214; BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 309. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 722.
[70] BAR, Mss Rom 3854, 214.
[71] BAR, Mss Rom 3854, 291. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 451-452.
[72] BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 4; BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 32-33. The request - but not the list - is reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 561. '…să aibă voe a purta doă pistoale, o sabie și o pușcă; iar nu mai mult.' See also BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 288.
[73] For examples, see Ialomița at BAR, Mss Rom 3866, 299-300 and Bucharest at BAR, Mss Rom 3866, 301-302 & 311.
[74] BAR, Mss Rom 3866, 328-333 & 340.
[75] The new French consul, Henri de Ségur, reported on 4 January 1849 that the Wallachian authorities suspected there were between twelve and fourteen thousand weapons in Bucharest, of which fewer than two thousand were recovered. See Ségur to Aupick, 4 January 1849. CAD, 166PO/E/169. For lists of confiscated weapons, see BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 47. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 554 (Bucharest). Records from Brăila, Buzău, Ialomița, Dâmbovița, Muscel, Romanați, Dolj, and Gorj are also available. See BAR, Mss Rom 3855, 210-211 and BAR, Mss Rom 3866, 338v-339r.
[76] BAR, Mss 3865, 158r.

approval to sell weapons in March 1850, but he didn't receive a final reply until January 1852. He had requested permission to sell eight rifles and eight pistols, and he was informed that he could sell these numbers and no more. He was obliged to record the names of the buyers and convey them to the relevant authorities.[77] If somebody had a weapon, then the government needed to know about it.

Information was indispensible to the counterrevolutionary order, and it needed to be kept in the right hands. Revolutionary propaganda was considered just as dangerous arms were. On the same day that Fuad and Cantacuzino banned peasants from carrying weapons, they decreed that any paper, proclamation, or newspaper published between 23 June and 25 September needed to be handed over to the government. Anyone found in breach of this decree would be 'punished after all the power of the law.'[78] The connection between information, arms, and sedition was made clear in the way the counterrevolutionary government proposed to round up revolutionary literature. It tasked the commissions for disarmament to gather documents, too.[79] The work was slow-going. A local official confiscated two copies of the revolutionary constitution from the village of Muereasca-de-Jos in Vâlcea County in March 1849.[80] The governor of Olt County provided a list of twelve people found in possession of revolutionary papers in May, and he sent another list with fourteen names a week later. Some had only one or two documents, but an official from one village had as many as forty examples stowed in his house.[81] The most detailed extant record comes from Gorj County in Oltenia from February 1850. Some 6,658 papers had been confiscated since the revolution. They included almost two thousand copies of the official government gazette, *Monitorul Român,* over a thousand issues of the peasant educational magazine *Invățătorul Satului,* and a similar number of Provisional Government proclamations.[82] Many other documents must have remained in general circulation. The governor of Gorj reported that his officers had collected 118 copies of Suleiman Pasha's proclamation to the Wallachian people, but the government's printing bill shows that some four thousand copies were ordered on 16 August.[83] A few hundred must have escaped counterrevolutionary hands in Gorj alone, although it's impossible to know how many had already been destroyed. The governor of Dâmbovița County sent the police to the home of

[77] All documents relating to the case of Carl Klar can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3849, 28-67.
[78] BAR, Mss Rom 3866, 10. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 501. 'va fi pedepsit după toată puterea legilor'
[79] See the report of the Governor of Vâlcea at BAR, Mss Rom 3865, 133. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 624.
[80] BAR, Mss Rom 3865, 178-179.
[81] BAR, Mss Rom 3865, 196-200.
[82] BAR, Mss Rom 3865, 222-223.
[83] BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 104v.

one Rovinaru in December 1848. He had been arrested for insubordination, and they wanted to see if he owned copies of revolutionary documents. The police officers returned with the news that Rovinaru's wife had already burned the lot.[84]

The gathering up of revolutionary propaganda was one of a raft of measures that were meant to restrict the flow of information to the Wallachian people. Censorship laws had their origins in the pre-revolutionary period, but these were often poorly enforced, and the revolution had illustrated the political importance of print. It didn't matter that less than thirteen percent of the Wallachian population could read or write.[85] The House of Winterhalder and Rosetti printed thousands of copies of government proclamations and newspapers, and these were distributed throughout the country and read aloud by itinerant propagandists, priests, schoolteachers, and local officials. Winterhalder even brought one of the firm's printing presses to Liberty Field on 27 June, and he and his employees distributed copies of a poem that celebrated the new freedom of the press.[86] This freedom did not survive the revolution's fall. Abigail Green has shown how the revolutions of 1848 inaugurated a new era of information management in the German states. Official and semi-official presses grew alongside liberal organs, and governments reacted to the news rather than suppressed it.[87] Other states would follow suit. Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte introduced severe measures against the oppositional press after his coup of 1851, but these were rarely used after the new regime had established itself.[88] The Wallachian counterrevolutionary regime pursued a strategy that was closer to those of Russia and Austria, where restrictions on the press remained common and were ramped up during times of political upheaval. The Galician Uprising of 1846 brought stricter controls on pamphlets and brochures printed in Austria concerning the Polish Question, and censorship would be tightened again during the uprising in Russian Poland in 1863-64, when several titles would be banned for 'high treason' and 'disturbing the peace.'[89] The reestablishment of censorship on foreign and domestic newspapers was one of the first measures adopted by the new regime in Wallachia.[90] Ad-hoc measures came into force in October, and a new draft project for censorship was drawn up in April 1849 to restrict both the creation and the distribution of information. It was devised by

---

[84] BAR, Mss Rom 3864, 164. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 554-555.
[85] Literacy figures for the period are difficult to establish. See Drace-Francis, *Modern Romanian Culture*, 41.
[86] For the printing bill, see BAR, Mss Rom 3880, 103-105; Jianu, *Circle of Friends,* 80-81; for the poem, see *Anul 1848,* I, 523. It is mistakenly identified as having been distributed on 23 June.
[87] Abigail Green, 'Intervening in the Public Sphere: German Governments and the Press, 1815-1870', *The Historical Journal*, 44.1 (2001), 155-175.
[88] See Clark, 'After 1848', 192.
[89] Case, *Age of Questions,* 49.
[90] Hory to Aupick, 10 October 1848. CAD, 166PO/E/168.

the Administrative Council and approved by General Duhamel. Its five chapters and fifty articles covered bookshops and booksellers, the import of books from abroad, censorship and customs, printing, and general observations on the functioning of the book and newspaper markets.[91] All of these conduits of information would be tightly regulated.

Strict controls were placed on native printing. No printer or lithographer could open for business without official approval, and the government reserved the right to only approve applications for locales where the necessary apparatus for oversight existed. 'Printing,' read Article 27 of the new censorship law, 'has an undeniable influence over society; it might be useful, or it might be pernicious, and so anybody wishing to pen a printer must have moral and material guarantees.'[92] It was not enough to be a man of good character. A printer had to be a man of means too, and before he could begin work he needed to obtain a government office through the Secretariat of State and swear an oath that he would guard his work with the greatest of care. Information, like weapons, had to be kept in respectable hands, and it needed to be licensed and subject to government oversight. A printer couldn't pass on his business without government authorisation. Any manuscript, translation, journal, or periodical—in short, any publication with the exception of theatre posters, commercial notices, tariffs, and visiting cards—had to be submitted to the Secretariat before it could be printed, and 'not even the smallest change' could be made to a censored manuscript without it passing through the censor's office once again. Only religious books printed by one of the Church printers were exempted from the Secretariat's oversight. These were instead subject to Church authorities. Lists of censored books would be maintained by the Secretariat's office to be checked against catalogues, and anyone found printing books that hadn't been censored would lose his publishing privileges. Approved information was to be made publicly available. Editors, authors, and printers were not only required to provide a copy of each printed book to the Secretariat of State. They also had to deposit five copies at the National Library of Saint Sava College in Bucharest and two at the school library in Craiova.[93] There were several ways to manage information after 1848. The German system that Abigail Green describes was one. The Wallachian system was another.

---

[91] *Anul 1848,* VI, 184-192; On tightening censorship after the revolution, see also Laurențiu Vlad, 'Scurte note cu privire la cenzura din Țara Românească: Două episoade din biografia lui Constantin N. Brăiloiu (1849-1850, 1858)', *Analele Universității București,* 4 (2002), 33-42.

[92] *Anul 1848,* VI, 189. 'Fiindcă tiparul are o influență netăgăduită asupra societății, care influență poate fi atât folositoare cât și vătămătoare, urmează ca oricine va dori să deschiză o tipografie, trebue să aibă chezășuri morale și materiale…'

[93] *Anul 1848,* VI, 188-191.

Censorship was meant to isolate Wallachia from the rest of the continent. The revolutionaries had attempted to Europeanise the Wallachian public sphere. Newspapers carried triumphant stories of revolutionary events abroad, and in Bucharest the people gathered to hear them read out in the evenings. The counterrevolutionaries closed these connections and provincialised the principality. Prohibitions on the export of cereals closed trade links during the final months of 1848, and tightened censorship laws kept undesirable information out of Wallachia. The *Gazeta de Transilvania* was the prime target of these laws because it appeared in the principality's native language. It had been banned in 1844, but copies continued to circulate. They crossed the Wallachian border tucked into men's trousers and stuffed down women's tops.[94] The Russian consul Charles de Kotzebue complained to Count Nesselrode in May 1848 that 'the circulation of the Transylvanian Gazette doesn't meet with the slightest obstacle from the censors, despite its frequent references to the position of the Moldo-Wallachians.'[95] He urged Prince Bibescu to be more proactive in keeping the newspaper out of the principality, but copies continued to cross the border into June.[96] Post-revolutionary controls were tighter. In early November the Caimacam gave instructions to the Interior Department that guards should be especially vigilant on the Austrian border and allow no copies of the *Gazeta de Transilvania* to enter without first passing under the censor's pen.[97] His instructions were relayed to all the governors of counties bordering Transylvania. Any papers of any kind found in the hands of travellers were to be sent to the Interior Department along with the names and residences of the people who carried them, and governors were instructed to publish Cantacuzino's edict to avoid people claiming ignorance of the law. Travellers arriving in Bucharest would also be searched, and special attention was paid to those who had passed through the Austrian lands.[98] Even diplomatic packets were affected by the controls of the winter of 1848. The British agent Effingham Grant complained repeatedly in his correspondence with Ion Ghica that he had little knowledge of what was happening in the rest of Europe. He didn't learn of the bombardment of Vienna on 26 October until 20 November, and on 24 November he wrote that the most recent newspaper

---

[94] Stan, *Revoluția Română*, 11. On the *Gazeta de Transilvania's* place in the revolutions of 1848, see Gelu Neamțu, 'Gazeta de Transilvania în revoluția de la 1848-1849', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițˌ* XXXV (1996), 132-159.

[95] Kotzebue to Nesselrode, 5 May 1848. Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 73. 'La circulation de la Gazette de Transylvanie n'a rencontré le moindre obstacle de la part de la censure malgré ses allusions fréquentes à la position des Moldo-Valaques.'

[96] Kotzebue to Nesselrode, 1 June 1848. Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 101-102.

[97] See also BAR, Doc Ist MCXV/30 for Duhamel's advice to Prince Sturdza of Moldavia on supervising newspapers imported via the Austrian post.

[98] BAR, Mss Rom 3864, 19-24.

from Paris he had seen was dated 15 October. Post usually took two weeks to reach Bucharest from Western Europe, but lines of communication had been closed for almost a month.[99]

An intellectual quarantine had been placed around Wallachia, and a new administrative apparatus was needed to oversee it. Customs officials and local governors complained of the arduous task of censorship. The governor of Brăila County informed the Interior Department in June 1849 that his office was struggling to cope with the burden. So many journals and gazettes entered the principality through the Danubian port that censorship left little time for other local government work.[100] The Secretariat of State responded by moving all censorship work to Bucharest. Foreign books and journals were to be sent to the capital to be read, censored, and returned, and only the *Constantinople Journal* was free to circulate without government intervention.[101] In May 1850 one Franz Graf was detained at the Wallachian border with Transylvania. He was travelling from Brașov to Pitești, and he had fifty-five typed gazettes and books in his possession as well as thirty-seven works written by hand. Some were in German, others French, and a few in Italian. Graf was a surgeon, and he told the border officials that the books were all medical textbooks needed for his work, but the agents confiscated the lot in accordance with article 8 of the new censorship law, and they were sent to Bucharest to be read.[102] Another confiscated package from July 1851 contained catalogues and agricultural textbooks, and brochures and private correspondence were seized, too.[103] A packet of brochures addressed to one Dimitrie, chandler, was confiscated in Giurgiu in June 1851, and in July the governor of Brăila passed on letters addressed to Vasilie Veldiceanu and Manole Ioan.[104] Foreign citizens were not exempt from this oversight. The Greek vice-consul at Brăila complained in early September 1851 about the confiscation of material from the bags of Greek subjects. The Secretariat of State responded by directing local officials to open all correspondence on the spot. If it was exclusively mercantile, then it could be returned immediately, but brochures and manuscripts had to be passed on to the censors.[105] Foreign agents could still receive books and materials sent through official channels and meant for their exclusive use, but all private correspondence needed to be censored.[106] In September 1851 the acting British consul

[99] Grant to Ghica, 20 & 24 November 1848. BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(8-9)/DCXVI.
[100] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 97.
[101] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 100. Printed matter from Moldavia was also exempt from Wallachian censorship as the two principalities were subject to the same regime. See *Anul 1848,* VI, 186.
[102] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 134-135.
[103] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 158.
[104] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 156 & 163.
[105] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 231.
[106] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 131.

Effingham Grant complained that a private letter addressed to him had been seized at the border. The Foreign Ministry was unapologetic. All letters carried via private channels had to be given up. The Interior Department would deliver them once they had been read and censored.[107]

The bureaucratic apparatus of the state expanded to keep information in check. Booksellers had to provide catalogues to local and national authorities, and police forces, censors, and local governors were all authorised to visit their shops to check they were only selling those works listed in the catalogues.[108] The task proved easier in some localities than in others. When directed to exercise a rigorous surveillance of booksellers within their jurisdictions in October and November 1848, the governors of Brăila, Ilfov, Argeș, Vâlcea, and Mehedinți Counties all returned the same response: there are no booksellers here.[109] But the new regime was not only interested in what information was being spread. In July 1851 the governor of Dolj County filed eight reports on foreign correspondence entering the principality through his jurisdiction. Each report was accompanied by a list of the names and addresses of the people to whom letters and books were being sent.[110] This information would allow the Interior Department to deliver material once it had been censored, but it also helped the government to expand its knowledge of the reading public. Censorship was not just about keeping information out of the wrong hands. It was about discovering the identities of the people to whom those hands belonged. Article 46 of the new censorship law made this objective clear. All booksellers who took subscriptions for gazettes, journals, and other periodical publications had to provide lists of subscribers to the Secretariat of State, and the same information was demanded of consular agents who imported foreign newspapers via their national post.[111]

The informational *cordon sanitaire* around Wallachia was part of an international counterrevolutionary effort. It wasn't just the Russians and the Ottomans who were interested in preventing the spread of dissident ideology. The Austrians were, too. Robebrt Colquhoun reported to Lord Palmerston in July 1849 that the Austrian post was no longer taking subscriptions for French and German newspapers from anybody who wasn't an agent of a foreign government.[112] The agents of the new Austrian Interior Minister Alexander von Bach intercepted correspondence between Wallachian émigrés and their friends in the principality.

---

[107] BAR, Mss Rom 3849, 298-299.
[108] *Anul 1848,* VI, 191.
[109] BAR, Mss Rom 3872, 13 (Ilfov), 15 (Brăila), 18 (Argeș), 21 (Vâlcea) & 47 (Mehedinți).
[110] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 177-187.
[111] *Anul 1848,* VI, 191.
[112] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 6 July 1849. TNA, FO 78/788, 112v.

They even read the letters of the British agent Effingham Grant, whom they rightly suspected of being a conduit for the exiles.[113] In May 1851 the Austrian consul Anton von Laurin advised the Wallachian government that he would be taking a more active role in supervising the Austrian post. He was concerned that agents were picking up letters outside of official post offices, packets were going missing en route, and agents were taking detours. The post from Sibiu reached the border point of Câineni at lunchtime on Tuesday, but the twenty-four-hour journey to Bucharest often took until Thursday morning.[114] Von Laurin was most concerned about Hungarian revolutionaries, but he often shared information on Wallachian exiles and their contact with the principality. In July 1851 he supplied two lists of twenty-seven names of people to whom material had been sent by exiles in Paris, and in October he informed the Wallachian Foreign Secretary that Ion Heliade Rădulescu had attempted to send copies of a political brochure to several people in Bucharest.[115] The names that von Laurin provided were not necessarily those of revolutionary supporters. At the head of one list was the reigning Prince Barbu Știrbei. The gathering of this information was not necessarily meant to discover dissidents. It was part of an international effort to extend the administrative reach of the state and control the flow of information.

Schools were also affected by the counterrevolutionary government's efforts to control information. Dissent hadn't only spread via the printed word during the summer. Revolutionary propaganda was just as reliant upon the spoken word too, and many of the government's chief propagandists had been schoolteachers. Charles de Kotzebue had been wary of their influence since before the revolution. He informed Count Nesselrode on 1 June that rural schoolteachers from Transylvania were spreading subversive ideas through the Wallachian countryside, and he advised Prince Bibescu to remove them from their positions.[116] Bibescu ignored Kotzebue's advice, and the counterrevolution offered an opportunity to correct his mistake. Seventeen schoolteachers were identified as propagandists in the pay of the revolutionary government, and several continued to stoke disorder.[117] The governor of Teleorman County blamed schoolteachers for the unrest in the villages of Piatra, Viișoara, and Lisa in October. He recommended that an example be made by having them whipped in the middle of the villages, and the governor of Argeș reported in late October that

[113] See Mihai-Ștefan Ceaușu & Dumitru Vitcu, 'Romanian Emigration and the Epilogue of the 1848 Revolution', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XLIII (2004), 89-109.
[114] BAR, Mss Rom 3871, 139-140.
[115] BAR, Mss Rom 3849, 269-270; BAR, Mss Rom 3849, 300.
[116] Kotzebue to Nesselrode, 1 June 1848. Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 101-102. For more on Transylvanian participation, see Maria Totu, 'Participarea românilor din Transilvania la revoluția de la 1848 în Țara Românească', *Revista de Istorie*, 29 (1976), 841-864.
[117] *Anul 1848,* V, 201-202.

eight teachers had compromised themselves by stirring up disobedience in one of his districts.[118] Other schoolteachers had fled the principality in the wake of the Ottoman invasion. All would need to be replaced with men of learning, industriousness, and morality. Native Wallachians were prioritised over foreigners, but there were too few to fill all the vacancies. Many schoolhouses were also closed to serve as barracks and hospitals for the occupying armies, and on 13 November the Schools Commission closed every school in the country. Teachers were instructed to turn over furniture and equipment to local magistrates including the entire contents of school libraries along with catalogues of books, registers of instruction, maps, globes, blackboards, and Lancasterian tables. Lists of all items were to be sent to the commission.[119] By March 1849, Robert Colquhoun reckoned that every public school in the country had been suppressed.[120] A few private institutions continued to operate, but even these struggled under the weight of occupation. One French schoolteacher at Bucharest, Madame de Grandpré, complained of the burden of housing several Russian soldiers in February 1849. It was a serious inconvenience in a house for the education of young women.[121] But the school wasn't closed down. An institution like Grandpré's was beyond the reach of most Wallachians. Private schools catered exclusively to the wealthiest inhabitants of the principality. Information could be trusted in their hands.

Priests were targeted for their role in the spread of revolutionary propaganda, too. The role of the clergy is often overlooked in histories of the revolutions of 1848. There were isolated outbursts of anticlericalism across Europe, but in France these were less pronounced than they had been after the revolution of 1830, and in Venice they were directed exclusively against the headquarters of the Jesuit Order, which had strong links to the Austrian state.[122] Church bells in both Milan and Bucharest announced the outbreak of revolution, and clergymen in the Veneto and the Wallachian countryside preached revolutionary ideology to their congregations.[123] Fuad and Cantacuzino ordered Metropolitan Neofit to remove any priests who had been active in serving the revolutionary cause from their parishes. They were to be sequestered in monasteries and kept under strict supervision. Only those who showed

---

[118] BAR, Mss Rom 3851, 101. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 97-98; *Anul 1848,* V, 210.
[119] *Anul 1848,* V, 334.
[120] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 2 March 1849. TNA, FO 78/787, 12v.
[121] BAR, Mss Rom 3846, 350. The French consul, Henri de Ségur, doesn't give a figure for the number of soldiers being housed by Mme de Grandpré, but in the same month R.G. Colquhoun estimated that every house in Bucharest had five or six soldiers billeted in it. See Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 23 February 1849. TNA, FO 78/787, 98v.
[122] Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 131; Ginsborg, *Daniele Manin*, 118.
[123] Ginsborg, *Daniele Manin,* 77-78, 165, 369.

genuine regret could be restored to society and returned to their hearths.[124] Neofit identified several men who had played prominent roles in the revolution. Radu Șapcă of Celeiu Village in Romanați County had blessed the Islaz Proclamation on 21 June. Athanasie Stoenescu of Craiova was active in the city's revolutionary clubs, Venamin was a propagandist in Dolj County, and one Zăgănescu performed the same role in Vâlcea.[125] Several local governors also reported instances of priests encouraging peasants to resist the counterrevolutionary order.[126] The new Wallachian Criminal Code of 1850 introduced specific punishments for political dissent by priests. Article 158 mandated that any priest who spoke against the ruler or any law or decree of the state would be imprisoned for between two and eighteen months. Article 159 stated that if the priest's words were meant to encourage popular disobedience then he would be sent to do hard labour in Giurgiu. He would serve a three-year term if the people ignored him and a five-year term if they listened. Article 160 threatened an even greater punishment, 'whatever it will be,' if the priest's words led to revolt or rebellion.[127] The specific application of these laws to priests recognised the significance of their religious authority over the people. It could not be put to political ends.

Opportunities for public dissent needed to be limited. A curfew was imposed on the same day that the Ottomans entered Bucharest, and public gatherings and noisy meetings were forbidden in the city from early October.[128] These new restrictions were tied to the government's efforts to restrict access to information. Anyone disturbing the peace of the country through speech, writing, or any other outlet would be arrested, judged, and punished after all the power of the law.[129] Police forces were directed to keep close watch on cafés, restaurants, and other public spaces and to look out especially for any prohibited reading materials.[130] Enforcement was vigorous. Robert Colquhoun reported to Lord Palmerston in July 1849 that 'a system of police and of espionage has during the last six months been established most disagreable [sic] to all residents accustomed to the mild regime which formerly prevailed, and which resembles that of Russia or Austria.' Discussion of politics and

---

[124] BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 10. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 477.
[125] BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 35 & 37. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 554 & 555.
[126] BAR, Mss Rom 3963, 104, 58 & 107. Latter two also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 559 & 696-697.
[127] *Condica Criminală cu Procedura Ei. Întocmită în zilele și prin părinteasca îngrijire a Prea Înălțatului Domn Stăpânitor a toată Țara Românească, Barbu Dimitrie Știrbei, întărită prin luminatul ofis cu No. 1644 din 5 Decembrie 1850, tipărită după înaltă slobozenie prin îngrijirea și cu cheltuiala Pah. Ștefan Burche*, (Bucharest: Tipografia lui Iosef Copainir, 1851), 53-54. '…va osândi la acea mai mare pedeapsă, ori care va fi.' My eternal gratitude to Zoë Hitzig for painstakingly photographing one of the few extant copies of this book in the Harvard Law School Library.
[128] *Anul 1848,* IV, 321.
[129] BAR, Mss Rom 3863, 6. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 457.
[130] BAR, Doc Ist MCXV/30. Duhamel is addressing the Prince of Moldavia, Mihail Sturdza, here, but he refers to similar measures being adopted in Wallachia.

foreign affairs was forbidden.[131] The new restrictions on the public realm must have had a dramatic effect on the landscape of the Wallachian capital. The bells that had rung so frequently during the summer were silenced, and when an Armenian named Carl dared to sound one in early December 1848 he was promptly arrested for disturbing the peace.[132] The prohibition on public gatherings was so strict that the people of Bucharest had to seek permission from the Caimacam to stage a traditional nativity procession. The Bucharest Police recommended the request be granted, and Cantacuzino duly agreed on Christmas Eve.[133]

Public order required new restrictions on the movement of people. The population of Bucharest swelled during the summer. Robert Colquhoun estimated that there were some thirty thousand peasants camped around the city when the Ottoman army arrived in September. They congregated to the east and the south of the Wallachian capital in the neighbourhoods of Cotroceni and Văcărești. The number fell to twenty thousand by 24 September, and only three thousand remained the following morning.[134] Colquhoun's figures might be exaggerated, but it's clear that the revolution led to a substantial movement of people towards the Wallachian capital. The new government considered these people a grave threat to public order, and on 3 October Fuad and Cantacuzino announced the establishment of a commission to investigate anybody who could neither prove a livelihood in the city nor produce a certificate of residence. Vagabonds—as the decree called them—would be removed from the city immediately. Foreign subjects would be deported alongside those who couldn't provide a certificate guaranteeing good conduct. Peasants who had fled the fields and workers who had abandoned their trades to 'lead an unregulated life' would be returned to their villages and towns and placed under police supervision. Five boyars were named to the commission to investigate vagabonds, and they were directed to engage with the city's police to round them up. Provincial governors were instructed to establish their own commissions to deal with the same problems in their counties. The objective was to cleanse the principality of those who lived by disorder.[135] Measures against vagabonds were about more than just the legacy of the revolution. They were intended to maintain public order by criminalising those who existed outside the boundaries of acceptable society. The

[131] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 6 July 1849. TNA, FO 78/788, 112r-v.
[132] BAR, Mss Rom 3864, 124. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 504-505.
[133] BAR, Mss Rom 3892, 214-218.
[134] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 28 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 57-60. For a map showing the locations of the peasant and Ottoman camps, see TNA, FO 78/743, 66.
[135] BAR, Mss Rom 3851, 6 and BAR, Mss Rom 3872, 149-150 & 158. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 475-476. '…să petreacă o vieață neregulată…'

Commander of the Russian Army in Oltenia, General Hasfort, summed up the commission's remit in December. It wasn't meant only to identify people who had played an active part in the revolution, but 'much more' to identify people who could neither demonstrate a legal right nor provide guarantees of their settled status and livelihoods. He labelled those who did not meet these conditions as 'vagabonds and timewasters.'[136] The descriptions of the men arrested in Bucharest offer an indication of their social status. Most were in their twenties and thirties. Some wore the uniforms of their trades and others Hungarian or German garb, although their names identify them as Romanian-speaking Transylvanians and Jews. Many more were described as being dressed in 'poor clothing.'[137] These people were all regarded as threats to the social order, and their existence was criminalised.

Restrictions on vagabonds needed a new bureaucratic apparatus, although some people continued to evade official structures. Bills of surety were given to those who provided the necessary guarantees to the commission on vagabonds. In Bucharest, these named the bearer, his father, his neighbourhood, district, and house number, and they included the details of whoever guaranteed his future good conduct, too. All were stamped with the commission's seal, and recipients were required to keep them about their person.[138] Physical descriptions of vagabonds were entered into registers to be kept at entry points along the Wallachian borders. Several deportees had managed to return to the principality during November and December of 1848, and as the year drew to a close the commission sitting in Bucharest recommended greater oversight. The names, parentage, and all physical characteristics of deportees were to be recorded, and nobody was allowed to enter Wallachia without being checked against the descriptions in registers first.[139] Arrivals and departures were also recorded at the gates of Bucharest along with travellers' origins or destinations and details of the documents under which they travelled.[140] It didn't matter whether they were leaving the principality or simply travelling to another town or city. All travel into and out of the capital had to be recorded, although the Russian General Daniilevski was concerned that people

---

[136] BAR, Mss Rom 3873, 146-147, 146r. '….temeiul întocmiri aceștii Comisii nu este numai ca să se descopera lucrărea persoanelor care au luat parte activă la trecuta revoluție, ci mai mult ca să descopere pe toate acele personae care nefiind în stare să arata drepturi leguite și chezășì temeinice de ființa lor și de mijloacele cu care pot trăi, și care nu se pot numi decît niște vagabonzi și pierzători de vreme în zadar.'

[137] See BAR, Mss Rom 3873 for examples. At 83, 104 & 119 are three men dressed in 'haine proaste'. At 120 is a twenty-four-year-old man named Alecu, who was dressed in his artisan's outfit, and at 330-331 one Telaru, son of Abram, who wore German clothing. He was thirty years old, tall, and with a nose and mouth in keeping with the general proportions of his face.

[138] For an example, see BAR, Mss Rom 3872, 317.

[139] BAR, Mss Rom 3873, 46.

[140] For an example, see the lists for the five days between 20 and 25 February 1849 at ANIC, 601/1/1848, II, 378-382.

continued to enter and exit in secret. They didn't use the known barriers. They found other ways in and out of the city and frequented its inns, cafés, casinos, and restaurants. He recommended several measures to combat this clandestine activity. Inns and any other places that received foreigners were required to keep detailed records, which had to be lodged with the city's police force within an hour of arrival.[141] It is difficult to judge how effective these measures were. The commission on unrest in Bucharest reported in March 1849 that several vagabonds who had been ordered back to their home counties had already returned to the city, although it seems unlikely that many found refuge in the city's inns. Most rooms were occupied by Russian and Ottoman soldiers.[142]

Women were often viewed as revolutionary conduits by counterrevolutionary regimes after 1848, and the new Wallachian government took an active interest in the lives and movements of the mothers, sisters, and wives of revolutionaries. Women's participation in the revolution is difficult to gauge. Few traces exist in the historical record. Ana Ipătescu's name is most frequently mentioned by historians, and Jules Michelet celebrated Maria Rosetti's role in liberating several of the revolutionary leaders from the grip of Ottoman soldiers in his *Légendes Démocratiques du Nord.* She also offered English lessons to people in Bucharest who wished to learn the language, and the money she received in payment was donated to the revolutionary cause.[143] Ion Brătianu wrote that 'many women were favourable to the movement' in a brief account that he penned during his exile in Paris, and he credited Gheorghe Magheru's daughter, Alexandrina Haralambie, with convincing her father to join the revolutionary cause.[144] The counterrevolutionary regime was suspicious of these female relations. It considered them points of connection between the principality and the revolutionary exiles. Zoe Golescu was the most prominent to be subjected to government scrutiny. Her sons and nephews were among the leaders of the revolution, and she had fled to Brașov in Transylvania to escape the invading armies. She returned to her family's estate during the spring of 1849 when the Hungarians took control of the city, and, an immediate

---

[141] BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 194. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 727-728.
[142] Thirty-one Russian soldiers occupied rooms at Hanul lui Manuc, for instance, in June 1849. See BAR, Mss Rom 3846, 555.
[143] For mentions of Ipătescu, see Gabriella Hauch, 'Did Women Have a Revolution? Gender Battles in the European Revolution of 1848/49', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 64-81, 74 and Gabriella Hauch, 'Women's Spaces in the Men's Revolution of 1848', in Dieter Dowe et al. eds., trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000), 639-682, 668-669; for Michelet's account of Maria Rosetti's involvement in the revolution, see Michelet, *Légendes Démocratiques du Nord,* 276-326; On Rosetti's English lessons, see *Anul 1848,* III, 207-208.
[144] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P CCVI/7, 5r. 'Multe femei erau favorabile mișcării. Astfel Ina Haralambie fu aceea care împinse pe tatăul sa G. Magheru, cărându-l în genunchi, și rugia d-ul să meargă ca revoluționaru.'

order was given that she should leave the principality without delay.[145] 'The spectacle of an elderly and dignified woman,' wrote Effingham Grant in a letter to Ion Ghica, 'being expatriated because the government supposes that she must be in correspondence with her sons is one of the monstrous anomalies that must stir the indignation of all men.'[146] Golescu's banishment was rescinded, and she moved to Bucharest in November, but General Lüders advised Prince Știrbei to keep a close watch over her activities.[147] The Austrians were just as worried that women were acting as revolutionary agents. Consul Anton von Laurin raised concerns with the Wallachian Foreign Minister in May 1851 that several Hungarian women staying in Bucharest were thought to be acting as messengers for Hungarian exiles. He requested the Wallachian government exercise a strict surveillance over these 'feminine emissaries.'[148] Their movements threatened the informational quarantines of Central and Southeastern Europe.

The movement of people was closely connected to the movement of information, and new passport controls were meant to ensure that only those with legitimate reasons were able to travel. The Wallachian government couldn't monitor travellers while they were abroad. It lacked the foreign police networks of some of the Great Powers of Europe. Once a Wallachian crossed the border he was free to fraternise with whomever he chose, and that carried risks for internal order. There was no way to stop travellers meeting with revolutionary exiles in Paris, London, and elsewhere and carrying messages back to allies at home. Newspapers and letters could be censored, but word of mouth could not, and so the new regime needed to exercise tighter control over who could and could not cross the Wallachian border. Passports existed in the Danubian Principalities before the summer of 1848, but the process of getting one changed under the new regime, and it was closely connected to the investigations into the revolution. Requests for passports went to the highest levels of government. Local governors passed the names and details of applicants to the Interior Department, which informed the Caimacam himself.[149] The work in Bucharest was handled by the city's police force. Most requests came from merchants intending to buy and

---

[145] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 3 April 1849. TNA, FO 78/787, 193.
[146] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 11 April 1849. Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(29)/DCXVI. 'Le spectacle d'une vielle et digne dame, expatriée parceque [sic] le gouvernement suppose qu'elle doit être en correspondance, avec ses fils, est une de ces anomalies monstreuses [sic] qui doit faire éclater l'indignation de tout homme…'
[147] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/11, 70r. Also reprod. in Andrei Pippidi, 'Repatrierea exilaților după revoluția din 1848 din Țara Românească', *Revista Arhivelor* 2 (2008), 328-362, 331.
[148] BAR, Mss Rom 3849, 226.
[149] See, for instance, the report of the Interior Department along with a list of names of passport applicants from December 1848 at BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 65-66. The requests come from Muscel, Argeș, Dolj, Gorj, and Mehedinți.

sell goods abroad. On 17 December, for instance, three merchants named Alecsandru Chirilov, George Teodorache, and Costache Nenovici applied for passports to visit London by way of Saxony to buy goods to sell in the principality. The journey would take them four months. Their request was turned over to the commission investigating revolutionary participation. Its research was focussed on two specific crimes—the burning of the Organic Regulations and the defence of Bucharest against the Ottoman invasion—but it also recorded the names of revolutionary propagandists, local government officials, and others who had actively participated in the events of the summer. Anybody whose name had come up during the commission's investigations was forbidden to leave the principality, and the commission was cautious with its recommendations. Many of the people it investigated might not have been involved in either of the two crimes the commission was tasked with investigating, but if they had been involved in other revolutionary activities then their travel into and out of the principality could pose a threat to public order. In response to the three merchants' request, it informed the police that its investigations were still ongoing, and it could not give a final answer until the work was complete.[150] Travel restrictions also applied on the movement of people between the two Danubian Principalities. Merchants wishing to visit Iași had to follow the same procedures as those travelling west. In February 1849, for instance, a Bucharest merchant sought permission to spend three months in the Moldavian capital selling headscarves.[151] Newspapers and books from Moldavia were exempted from Wallachian restrictions because they were subject to censorship already, but people could carry messages that were not written down.

Passport requests generated a huge amount of administrative work, and new procedures were introduced that relied upon local government. Every applicant had to be investigated. The burden first fell upon the Interior Department, but in January 1849 Interior Minister Ion Filipescu advised Cantacuzino that the task was too great. Like the local administration in Brăila, which struggled with the burden of new censorship laws, his men lacked both the time and the resources to conduct the research the new passport laws required. He suggested that the work should be delegated to local governments and police forces. These bodies could conduct initial enquiries into a person's involvement in the revolution and establish whether he was of good character. Requests for passports could then be passed to central government

[150] ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 93-94. Numerous similar requests can be found in volumes I, II & III. For instance, ANIC, 601/1/1848, II, 306, 316, 326, 334, 342, 346, 361, 368, 369, 372. Many more passport requests can also be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3894. See, for instance, BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 213-220 for seven requests all dated 24 January 1849 alone.
[151] BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 434.

with a recommendation.[152] Successful applicants received single-leaf documents that measured roughly thirty by forty-two centimetres. These were headed with the name and seal of the Wallachian Prince and recorded the details of the bearer—including a physical description—in Romanian and either Ottoman Turkish or French depending on the direction of travel. Entrances and exits were recorded on the back.[153] Creating false documents was considered a serious crime. The new Wallachian Criminal Code of 1850 stipulated that anyone who forged a passport or *răvaș de drum*—the document required for travelling between towns and cities in the principality—would be punished by six months to a year in prison, and the same punishment was applied to those travelling under forged documents, too.[154]

Controlling Wallachia's borders meant enforcing defined border points. Border points kept registers of names, origins, and the destinations of travellers, and these were communicated to the Interior Department at regular intervals for central government oversight.[155] Crossing the border could not be a casual activity. Peasants living in villages in the Carpathian Mountains often travelled back and forth between Wallachia and Transylvania on a daily basis. Some worked land across the border, and others led their animals to pasture. They traversed the countless paths that crossed through the mountains, which were only known to peasants and smugglers in contraband. The Russian Generals Duhamel and Lüders insisted the government get a grip on this unsupervised travel, and the Interior Minister Ion Filipescu issued the necessary instructions on 29 November 1848.[156] All peasants were required to carry passports and travel by known routes into and out of the principality. Crossing the border by any other path was illegal.[157] It's difficult to know how closely this directive was observed. The inhabitants of one village in Muscel County sought government permission in March 1849 to tend their lands on the other side of the border, but many peasants likely ignored the new law and continued to cross into Transylvania by their traditional routes.[158] It was impossible to hermetically seal the border, as General Duhamel complained to Count Nesselrode in January 1849, and there were even rumours that Ion

[152] BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 180.
[153] For examples of passports from this era, see BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P CCXCV/7, 1-21.
[154] *Condica Criminală*, 43-44.
[155] See, for instance, the report from the border point of Dragoslavele in Argeș County for 30 December 1848 to 1 January 1849 at BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 271-272. It's followed by the reports for 1 to 3 January 1849 and 3 to 5 January at BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 273-276 & 279-280.
[156] BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 8. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 402-403.
[157] BAR, Mss Rom 3894, 10 (Romanian) & 11 (French). The Romanian is reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 444-445.
[158] BAR, Mss Rom 3895, 312.

Heliade Rădulescu—one of the three members of the Princely Lieutenancy—had entered the principality disguised as a peasant.[159]

Ongoing revolutionary instability in Transylvania threatened the post-revolutionary order in Wallachia and imposed new burdens on the principality. Forty-thousand people died during the war between the Hungarian revolutionaries and the counterrevolutionary forces of Austria and Russia.[160] Russian involvement was facilitated by the occupation of the two Danubian Principalities. It provided a base and supplies for the Russian army, and the principality also bore the burden of Austrian troop movements. The Austrian army crossed Wallachian territory in the summer of 1849. Soldiers marched through every county in Oltenia and crossed Argeș, Muscel, Dâmbovița, Prahova, and Ilfov Counties, too. Disease and hardship came with them. As Richard Evans has shown, troop movements accelerated the spread of epidemics and prolonged outbreaks during the years 1848 to 1849.[161] Austrian soldiers refused to observe the quarantine and sanitary procedures that had been put in place for their passage. Typhus and cholera ravaged the towns and villages they passed through, and many soldiers were left behind in hospitals in Râmnic and Pitești.[162] Outbreaks of epizootic diseases were also common. More than seven thousand beasts succumbed to disease during the first half of 1849. Serious epidemics had occurred in 1846 and 1847, but the counties most heavily affected in 1849 were all ones that saw Austrian troop movements. The heaviest losses were in Mehedinți, which bordered the Austrian Banat.[163] Austrian soldiers seized wheat from the fields and grazed their horses on farmers' pastures. Local protests were met with the response that the fodder provided to the Austrians was insufficient.[164] The military ran up debts in the principality that exceeded 270,000 lei over the course of 1849. Foodstuffs were the greatest expense, but the soldiers also caused some 109,492 lei of damages.[165] The Wallachian government was still pursuing these debts five years later.[166]

The war in Transylvania created a refugee crisis in Wallachia. Zoe Golescu was one of thousands of people who fled the revolutionary conflict in Transylvania. The crisis began in the winter of 1848, long before the Austrian and Russian armies intervened. A courier

---

[159] Duhamel to Nesselrode, 4 January 1849. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 422-424.
[160] For an account of counterrevolution in the Austrian lands, see Sperber, *European Revolutions,* 216-225. On Russian involvement specifically see Jelavich, 'Russian Intervention', 31-37.
[161] Evans, 'Cholera in Nineteenth Century Europe', 135.
[162] For the sick soldiers left behind, see BAR, Mss Rom 3848, 98.
[163] BAR, Mss Rom 3847, 5.
[164] Account taken from the report of the Wallachian Interior Department. BAR, Mss Rom 3848, 102-104 (Romanian) & 106-107 (French).
[165] BAR, Mss Rom 3847, 169v-170r.
[166] For the long-running correspondence between the Wallachian government and the Austrian agent in Bucharest on the matter, see BAR, Mss Rom 3847, 78-272.

delivered a report to the Interior Department from the local government in Prahova in November. It described the arrival of some five hundred Transylvanian Romanians who had sought asylum in the county. Many were dying of hunger, and local officials had provided them with food and water and set up camps to prevent them disappearing into the Wallachian countryside. Cantacuzino instructed the Prahovan government to continue to feed the refugees, but also to disarm them. He sought the advice of Lüders and Fuad on how to proceed as the number of refugees continued to rise.[167] There were 957 refugees in Prahova alone by the end of the year, and by April 1849 some fifteen thousand Transylvanians were spread across Wallachia.[168] Some took refuge in monasteries, but there were too many for the Church to provide for alone.[169] Cantacuzino appointed a special commission to organise material relief for the refugees in January 1849, and a public subscription was introduced. Apostol Stan described the donations by private citizens as a 'spontaneous manifestation of national consciousness' in his 1987 study of solidarity and national unity in the 1848 revolutions in the Romanian lands, but the conclusion of his 1970 article co-authored with Constantin Căzănișteanu was more compelling.[170] The two men argued that the help offered to refugees should be understood as an attempt by authorities to prevent further unrest and as a spontaneous manifestation of the unity of peoples.[171] Not all of the refugees were of Romanian descent or spoke the language. There were Hungarians, Germans, and Szeklers too, and Cantacuzino's announcement of the subscription did not appeal to national sentiments, but to humanity and charity.[172] He donated 3,150 lei from his personal fortune, and the Wallacian government gave 23,625 lei. All of the members of the new commission made contributions, and so did the Church and the officers of the army.[173] Twenty-four merchants of Bucharest donated in February, and the new National Theatre

[167] BAR, Mss Rom 3837, 10 & 11.
[168] Constantin Căzănișteanu & Apostol Stan, 'Refugiați Transilvăneni în timpul revoluției de la 1848-1849 în Țara Românească', *Studii*, 23 (1970), 501-519, 503-504.
[169] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 12 January 1849. BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(16)/DCXVI.
[170] Stan, *Revoluția română*, 337. 'o manifestare spontană a conștiinței naționale'. Dumitru Garoafă also emphasises the sympathy and compassion with which the refugees were received by 'conaționalii lor'. See Dumitru Garoafă, 'Refugiați Transilvăneni în județul Vâlcea în timpul revoluției de la 1848-1849', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițˇ* XL (2001), 79-85.
[171] Căzănișteanu & Stan, 'Refugiați Transilvăneni', 519.
[172] See Cantacuzino's letter to the Austrian agent, Timoni, at BAR, Mss Rom 3837, 91.
[173] The organisers of the public subscription were decorated by the Austrian state. Constantin Ghica received the Order of Leopold and Dimitrie Ghica and Dimitrie Ioannides the Iron Crown, 3rd Class. See Mihaila Cosma, 'Refugiați Transilvani în Muntenia la 1849', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițˇ* XL (2001), 291-302, 301-302.

gave a concert in April to raise funds.[174] The two names at the top of the list of donors were those of Fuad and Duhamel. Each offered 31,500 lei on behalf of his government.[175]

The refugee crisis was contained in the borderlands for the first few months of 1849, but it soon reached Bucharest, and counterrevolutionary forces were anxious about the effect it would have on public order. Many refugees were craftsmen and artisans, but they were reliant upon handouts for survival in the refugee camps. The governor of Muscel asked the Interior Department in March whether it would be possible for refugees to travel to Bucharest and other towns and cities in the principality so that they could practise their trades. The Interior Department was reluctant to meet this request. Many refugees had neither passports nor guarantees of good character, and it would be impossible to exercise a strict surveillance over their activities if they were spread throughout the country.[176] A commission was established to draw up paperwork for the refugees. It issued certificates that recorded the names of refugees, details of their guarantors, and the length of their permitted residence in Wallachia.[177] All refugees were required to carry these certificates on their persons. Many headed for Bucharest once they were released from the camps. The British consul reported at the end of March 1849 that the city was 'besieged with crowds of Transylvanian refugees, who come here in the greatest state of destitution.' Measures were put in place to sustain them and prevent any disorder. Fuad and Omer Pasha provided meals for fifty refugees every day, and each company of Ottoman soldiers fed another thirty. Most were Saxons. Few had any money with them, and those who did carried only Austrian bank notes, which were not common in the city. Colquhoun reported that the Austrian currency had depreciated in value by thirty-two percent in one day alone, and the Austrian agent Timoni struggled to support his subjects. He applied for a loan from the city government, but received only a 'very limited amount,' and he was vexed by Russian police surveillance, which prevented many refugees from returning to Transylvania.[178]

The refugee crisis threatened to undermine counterrevolutionary efforts to isolate Wallachia and extirpate political dissent, and it also created a rift between Ottoman and Russian officials. Wallachian authorities feared that contact with Transylvanians might lead to another revolutionary outbreak. The Austrian agent Timoni advised Fuad that fifth

---

[174] For more on smaller donations, see Căzănișteanu & Stan, 'Refugiați Transilvăneni', 511-515.
[175] A list of the initial donations can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3837, 105v-106r. Fuad and Duhamel's letters are at BAR, Mss Rom 3837, 112 & 167.
[176] BAR, Mss Rom 3895, 315-316.
[177] BAR, Mss Rom 3837, 360.
[178] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 28 March 1849. TNA, FO 78/787, 183-184.

columnists might be travelling among the refugees.[179] This was one of the reasons for holding them in camps, and refugees were searched upon arrival to prevent foreign newspapers entering the principality. Proclamations of the Hungarian Revolutionary Government were confiscated, and anybody carrying revolutionary propaganda was turned back at the border.[180] Hungarians were regarded with particular suspicion by the Russians. They were considered the cause of the conflict in Transylvania, and General Duhamel announced in January or February of 1849 that the Russian military would deliver any Hungarian refugees into the hands of Austrian authorities, but Fuad refused to do likewise, and many Hungarian revolutionaries disappeared into the Ottoman Empire.[181] Some even converted to Islam and entered Ottoman service. The Polish general and Hungarian partisan Józef Bem became Murat Pasha and served as governor of Aleppo.[182] Lajos Kossuth condemned the practice, but around three hundred Hungarian soldiers converted and joined the Ottoman bureaucracy and military.[183] It was a better fate than that which met those who were apprehended in Wallachia. In September 1849 Timoni informed the Wallachian Foreign Secretary that one György Kolosy had entered the principality. Kolosy, he wrote, had served as a captain in Artúr Görgei's rebel Hungarian army, but he didn't mention that a year earlier he had also been involved in the assassination of the Austrian Count Lamberg as he crossed the Danube between Pest and Buda.[184] It was Lamberg's death that led the Austrian Court in Vienna to dissolve the Hungarian Parliament. Timoni asked that Kolosy be apprehended and returned to Transylvania.[185] He was caught and sent to Pest to stand trial, and in January 1850 the twenty-six year old Kolosy was executed by hanging. Counterrevolutionary simultaneity had decided his fate.

The counterrevolutionary government had introduced a systematic apparatus to control the movement of people and information, and the ongoing crisis in Transylvania tested its limits. Many Wallachian revolutionaries had fled into Transylvania after the Ottoman and Russian invasions. An Austrian foreign police report from Bucharest in 1849

---

[179] Timoni wrote to Fuad of this possibility in December 1848. See BAR, Mss Rom 3837 124.
[180] Căzănișteanu & Stan, 'Refugiați Transilvăneni', 507-508.
[181] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 3 February 1849. TNA, FO 78/787, 66v.
[182] Evans, *Pursuit of Power*, 209.
[183] Heléna Tóth, *An Exiled Generation: German and Hungarian Refugees of Revolution, 1848-1871,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 145.
[184] William Bernard MacCabe, *A True Account of the Hungarian Revolution; Its Purposes and Pretences: by An American Diplomat. With Preliminary Observations, Respecting the Liberals Abroad and the Liberal Party at Home. Especially Intended for the Perusal of Roman Catholics,* (London: Richardson and Son, 1851), 121-123. For diplomatic material on the Hungarian refugees in Ottoman lands, see *Correspondence Respecting Refugees from Hungary within the Turkish Dominions. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, February 28, 1851.* (London: Harrison & Son, 1851).
[185] BAR, Mss Rom 3848, 138.

identified some thirty individuals hiding in Transylvania. They included Cezar Bolliac—who had served on the commission on Roma slavery—and his wife, Ion Heliade Rădulescu and his brother, and one of the Ipătescu brothers and his wife.[186] Many fled farther afield when the situation in Transylvania deteriorated. The Ipătescus made their way into the Ottoman Empire, and Heliade Rădulescu travelled first to Paris before returning to Ottoman territory. Bolliac was one of the few to remain in Transylvania. He published a newspaper in exile called *Espatriatul*, which carried the revolutionary slogan of 'Justice, Brotherhood' as its subheading. One name that didn't appear on the Austrian list was that of Florian Aaron. He was living in Sibiu during the spring of 1849, but when the city fell under Hungarian occupation he quit his Transylvanian homeland for his adopted Wallachian one. The Wallachian authorities soon apprehended him, and he was brought before the commission charged with investigating revolutionaries for his actions during the summer.[187]

PUNISH

Discipline demanded punishment to maintain stability in Wallachia. As General Duhamel had put it in his letter to Fuad on 29 September 1848, the principality needed to be 'purged of the elements of anarchy which it harboured.'[188] The threat of revolution remained as long as there were revolutionaries at large. Most of the leaders of the Wallachian Revolution were apprehended on 24 September when they led a delegation to meet Fuad at his camp on the outskirts of Bucharest. They were held at Cotroceni Monastery to the southwest of the Wallachian capital, and the British consul was given assurances that they would be released into exile.[189] He reported to Lord Palmerston that both Fuad and Constantin Cantacuzino felt 'it would be better for all parties and the prisoners themselves that they should leave the country for some time.'[190] Many were given passports and released in October, but fifteen of the ringleaders were detained and sent up the Danube.[191] Their friend Effingham Grant caught up with them somewhere near the Serbian border village of

[186] Österreischisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA), Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA), Informationsbureau (IB), Actes du Hautes Police, 1849 Bucharest, No 183.
[187] Aaron's case can be found at ANIC 601/54/1849.
[188] Duhamel to Fuad, 29 September 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 279-280. 'le pays aura été purgé des élémens [sic] d'anarchie qu'il recèle'
[189] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 29 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 86-87.
[190] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 30 September 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 103-104.
[191] Some had passports from Cantacuzino and others from Colquhoun. Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 13 October 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 163.

Cladosnitza. He found their health good but their morale poor. They had neither shelter nor cloaks to protect themselves from the elements, and they knew nothing of what had followed their arrest. Grant reassured them that Fuad had promised they were to be set free in Austria, but it's unclear whether Fuad intended to keep his word.[192] Jules Michelet provided a dramatic retelling of the revolutionary leaders' escape in his *Légendes Démocratiques du Nord.* Grant's sister Maria Rosetti—whose husband was among the captives—approached the Turkish encampment with her young child in her arms, and when the prisoners saw her they cried 'Vive la République!' The Ottoman soldiers offered her food and found milk for her baby, who was born at the outbreak of the revolution and named Libertate, or Liby for short. One Turkish soldier whispered a word in Maria's ear: Bosnia. By this she understood that the Ottomans had changed their plans and were intending to transport the revolutionaries into the interior of the Ottoman Empire to be held captive at a Bosnian fortress. She followed the boat's course the next morning, travelling by Austrian steamer and then tumbledown carts, and the prisoners dived into the water when she gave the signal and swam for the banks. Together they fled into Austrian territory. Ottoman soldiers pursued them, but they were stopped by the inhabitants of a village called Sfenitza. The local mayor asked the soldiers for their passports. 'How dare you come armed into the lands of His Majesty the Emperor,' he demanded, and the revolutionaries escaped.[193] Michelet's account was a little fanciful, but the revolutionaries really did escape somewhere near Zemun in modern-day Serbia.[194] Their perpetual exile was confirmed by Fuad and Cantacuzino in April of the following year.[195]

The pursuit of revolutionary agents divided the Russian and Ottoman authorities in the principality. Duhamel suspected the Ottomans of sympathising with the revolutionary cause, and he complained to Nesselrode on 31 October that they were obstructing the work of his soldiers. The principality would be pacified far quicker if it were subject to a Russian occupation alone.[196] General Lüders forces seized revolutionary functionaries as they marched south from Moldavia. They arrested the president of the magistracy of Slam-Râmnic and a sub-administrator in late September.[197] Twenty functionaries in Buzău County were detained in late October, including the police chiefs of Buzău and Focșani, and the

---

[192] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 27 October 1848. BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(5)/DCXV; Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 20 October 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 181v-182.
[193] Michelet, *Légendes Démocratiques du Nord,* 303-315. « Où sont vos passe-ports ? leur dit le maire. En avez-vous ? Comment osez-vous bien venir en armes sur les terres de Sa Majesté l'empereur ? »
[194] For a discussion of their escape and Michelet's account, see Jianu, *Circle of Friends,* 99-103.
[195] For the full list of names, which included several other figures, see Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 469-470.
[196] Duhamel to Nesselrode, 31 October 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 320.
[197] *Anul 1848,* IV, 407-408.

former governor and his secretary.[198] Arrests in Bucharest began in November. The city's policing was the responsibility of the Ottomans, but Cossacks accompanied local police officers in effecting a wave of arrests on Sunday 5 November. They entered houses and dragged their occupants into the streets. Church services were disrupted and the house of the Belgian consul was invaded to seize a Belgian citizen.[199] Little regard was paid to diplomatic protocol. One man was even seized from the house of Omer Pasha, the Ottoman military commander in Bucharest. Sixty people were arrested in total. The French consul Hory reported that most of them were suspected of involvement in the burning of the Organic Regulations and the book of boyar ranks on 18 September.[200] It was an act that had challenged both the social and the geopolitical order of the principality. The detainees were treated poorly and transported under guard to Plumbuita Monastery to the northeast of the city.[201] Arrests became common occurrences after the policing of the city was divided between the two powers in early December. Russian soldiers took charge of the city on 8 December, and 'during that night twenty-eight arrests were made of persons who had hoped, from their insignificance, to have passed unnoticed.'[202] The wave of arrests swept through the principality. The governor of Dolj reported in early December that the Russian General Hasfort had apprehended several propagandists including a priest and a schoolteacher, and later that month the Caimacam directed the Interior Department to apprehend the former police chief of Pitești, a lawyer who was hiding in a village in Muscel, and several other figures associated with the revolution in Argeș.[203] By January 1849 the new French consul Henri de Ségur estimated that fifty to sixty people were arrested each day across Wallachia. He considered the arrests an attempt by the Russians to assert their authority. 'And so,' he wrote, 'Russia accustoms the Wallachian population to think that everything comes from her, that nothing should be expected from Constantinople.'[204] Effingham Grant saw little hope for the future. He told Ion Ghica in January that only God could know when the arrests would be over, and 'with a secret police already established, what guarantee is there against the intrigues of an enemy whose lies could incarcerate you?' Some ten thousand people were arrested in total.[205] They included participants in an earlier uprising in Brăila in 1842. The

[198] *Anul 1848,* V, 170-171.
[199] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 8 November 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 205r.
[200] Hory to Aupick, 6 November 1848. CAD, 166PO/E/168.
[201] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 10 November 1848. BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(7)/DCXVI.
[202] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 15 December 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 267r.
[203] BAR, Mss Rom 3864, 200 & 205. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 531 & 593.
[204] Ségur to Aupick, 4 January 1849. CAD, 166PO/E/169. 'La Russie habitue ainsi la population Valaque à penser que tout vient d'Elle ; qu'elle n'a rien à attendre de Constantinople.'
[205] Jianu, *Circle of Friends,* 104.

Provisional Government had set these men free in June. The counterrevolutionary regime rounded them up again after 25 September.[206]

The treatment of arrestees reinforced the pre-revolutionary social order. Ranks and titles had been abolished by the Islaz Proclamation and all citizens were declared equal, but this change didn't survive the fall of the revolution in September. Social status and wealth affected the post-revolutionary lives of those who had been caught up in events during the summer. The prominent bankers Hillel Manoah and Solomon Halfon had both supported the revolution. Manoah served on the Bucharest Municipal Council, and Halfon was one of the signatories of a letter that recognised the Princely Lieutenancy as the legitimate government of the land.[207] Both men were soon bailed. Caimacam Constantin Cantacuzino gave his personal guarantee for their future good conduct, and Fuad later drew on Manoah's bank to finance the Ottoman occupation and contribution to the relief of Transylvanian refugees.[208] The young Gheorghe Filipescu was also treated leniently. Filipescu had served with Gheorghe Magheru in the Wallachian revolutionary army, but after Magheru disbanded his forces and fled into exile, Filipescu returned to Bucharest. His father was a favourite of the Russians and had just been named the new Interior Secretary. Ottoman forces arrested the younger Filipescu in response to the Russian pursuit of minor revolutionary figures. Robert Colquhoun urged Fuad to be wary. He told the Ottoman Commissar that if he intended to take action against all those who had been implicated in the revolution, then he would have to arrest Cantacuzino, the new Finance Minister, Interior Minister Filipescu, and 'many others too numerous to mention.'[209] Colquhoun suggested that Fuad would do better to gather Filipescu's family and several boyars and notables of the city and make a show of pardoning the young man for his deeds.[210] Fuad took Colquhoun's advice. In a letter pardoning Filipescu, he wrote that he would have liked to offer a general amnesty, but that circumstances—the Russian presence—had denied him that possibility. Filipescu's arrest was driven by the Sultan's desire that justice should be administered equally

---

[206] The work continued into the 1850s. For documents relating to their release in June, their supervision by secret police, and their recapture, see BAR, Mss Rom, 3859, 94-344.
[207] See *Anul 1848,* III, 304-305 for an example of a Bucharest Municipal Council document with Manoah's name appended and *Anul 1848*, III, 320 for the letter that he and Halfon both signed.
[208] Release reported by Colquhoun to Palmerston, 8 November, 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 206v-207r; On loans for the occupation, see, for example, BAR, Mss Rom 3831, 439; on a loan for refugee relief, see BAR, Mss Rom 3837, 112.
[209] Cantacuzino, for instance, was among those who had provided financial support for a revolutionary committee in May. See chapter 2.
[210] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 8 November 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 206r-v. Colquhoun elsewhere wrote that Cantacuzino was one of Prince Bibescu's strongest opponents and that he had proof that Cantacuzino had played a part in the movement that led to the revolution. See Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 6 October 1848, TNA, FO 78/743, 118v-119r & Colquhoun to Palmerston, 5 March 1849. TNA, FO 78/787, 111v.

for all classes of his subject, but the young man shouldn't be treated too harshly. He had been led astray, and Fuad pardoned him as part of the celebrations of Ramadan. He advised the young Filipescu to learn from his father's example. The older man could inspire respect for the laws of the land and gratitude towards the Sultan, whose great generosity had been exercised in the younger Filipescu's favour.[211] Preferential treatment wasn't limited to pardons either. A list of detainees held in Văcărești Monastery from November 1848 divided the ninety-two inmates into three classes. The first class included Radu Ceaușescu, who had been one of the boyar representatives at the Property Commission in August, the priest Radu Șapcă, who had blessed the Islaz Proclamation in June, and the British citizen Nicolas Asprea.[212] Men of the first and second classes were considered nobles, while members of the third class were treated as peasants. The average spend on a nobleman's food was 8 lei and 80 parales per day. Only 2 lei and 49 parales were spent on each peasant. All of the men were under investigation for the same crimes, but the preservation of the social order demanded that priests and boyars be treated better than peasants.

Conditions for prisoners were often poor, and contact with the outside world was restricted. The Russian consul Charles de Kotzebue visited Plumbuita Monastery—where the first detainees were held—in early November. He found cells with broken windows that exposed their occupants to the winds and the rains. Two sick prisoners had received no medical attention, and food supplies were limited.[213] Nineteen arrestees from Teleorman County complained that they hadn't been fed for two days.[214] Orders were given the following day to move the detainees to Văcărești Monastery to the south of the city, and Caimacam Cantacuzino directed the Interior Ministry to ensure access to food, light, and warmth, but conditions at Văcărești were not much better than those at Plumbuita.[215] The Russian General Daniilevski complained to the Interior Minister in March 1849 that the food provided to prisoners was of poor quality and often undercooked.[216] Several men fell ill during their incarceration. Ioan Ovedeanu of Craiova begged Daniilevski for his assistance. He had been arrested without a jacket, and he was freezing in his cell. Lüders gave orders for Ovedeanu to be moved to Colțea Hospital, and his condition improved under the care of one Doctor Maier, but Ovedeanu begged for his case to be brought forward so he could prove his

[211] Fuad to Cantacuzino, 10 November 1848. ANIC, 750/XXXIII/3.
[212] BAR, Mss Rom 3868, 83. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 545-546.
[213] *Anul 1848,* V, 282-283.
[214] *Anul 1848,* V, 286.
[215] *Anul 1848,* V, 294-295.
[216] BAR, Mss Rom 3868, 443. A defence of the quality of food provided was mounted by those who oversaw the prisoners. They said that poor quality food was never served and that the prisoners could eat what they liked. See BAR, Mss Rom 3868, 445 & 452.

innocence and return home.[217] Other prisoners shared Ovedeanu's sufferings. Wallachian monasteries were notorious for their draughtiness. Nicolae Bălcescu had contracted tuberculosis during the two years he spent incarcerated in Mărgineni Monastery during the reign of Alexandru II Ghica. He died of the same disease during his exile in 1852. By March 1849, twenty of the prisoners held at Vacarestu had been transferred to Colțea due to their poor health, and one man died while awaiting his investigation.[218] The prisoners were kept in isolation in hospital, and access to Văcărești was heavily restricted. One sympathetic Interior Ministry official named Dimitrache attempted to smuggle letters and other papers in loaves of bread and stuffed down his trousers, but he was discovered and himself arrested.[219] These restrictions placed a particular strain on family lives. In an appeal for the release of her son, one mother wrote that she hadn't seen him once in the four months since he was taken.[220] The only exceptions were made at Christmas. The commission investigating the detainees at Văcărești received many requests from mothers and wives wishing to visit their sons and husbands, and General Daniilevski gave permission for these visits to take place in the presence of both a commission employee and an officer of the guard.[221] Their presence was meant to ensure that politics wasn't discussed.

Family members suffered the emotional and economic consequences of the counterrevolutionary regime's efforts to remove revolutionaries from Wallachian society. Ion Ghica's mother died while her son was in exile, and she complained frequently to Effingham Grant in the months preceding her death that her son didn't write often enough.[222] Nicolae Pleșoianu's cousin died while he was in exile too, and his request to return for the funeral was denied.[223] Other men saw their families ruined during their exile.[224] The families of prisoners held at Văcărești suffered similar consequences. A man named Georgescu wrote that his parents were dying of starvation in his absence, and several detainees sought permission to settle their business affairs or requested to have their investigations fast-tracked for the sake of the wellbeing of their families.[225] Scarlat Voinescu wrote that his wife and children would starve without him, and his wife Pulcheria wrote that the family had been reduced to

---

[217] ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 200 & 213.
[218] BAR, Mss Rom 3868, 444; Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 22 February 1849. TNA, FO 78/787, 95v-96r.
[219] Dimitrache also passed news of the workings of the commission of investigation to the prisoners. BAR, Mss Rom 3864, 198. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* V, 594-595.
[220] ANIC, 601/1/1848, II, 394 & III, 407.
[221] ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 125.
[222] See, for instance, Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 10 November 1848. Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(7)/DCXVI.
[223] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/II, 37; Effingham Grant mentions her death in a letter. See Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 26 May 1849. Fonds Ion Ghica: s: 7(40)/DCXVI.
[224] See, for instance, the case of Grigorie Serrurie at BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/11, 14.
[225] ANIC, 601/1/1848, II, 358.

destitution in his absence. She worried that her husband had contracted dropsy and would be unable to support them.[226] Mothers, wives, fathers, sons, and daughters all wrote pleading letters seeking the release of their kin. Some claimed that their relatives were not revolutionary ideologues and had only participated in the revolution to provide for the wellbeing of their families. Apostol Cuțarida's father wrote that his son had only joined the militia to earn a little extra money for the family.[227] Others offered political arguments. In her appeal to General Duhamel in January 1849, Eliza Cantacuzino wrote that her husband Georges had spent the first few months of the revolution in Transylvania. He had only returned to serve the new government once it had been recognised by Suleiman Pasha.[228] He had participated in good faith and believed his actions were legal. She hoped that he and his family would not be punished under the circumstances.

New bureaucratic apparatuses were needed to investigate revolutionary participants. These took the form of commissions. The counterrevolutionary era was the great age of commissions in Wallachia. Both the pre-revolutionary and revolutionary governments had appointed commissions to deal with a variety of legal and administrative issues, but these were general commissions with broad remits.[229] The counterrevolutionary commissions were specialised, and their tasks were connected to maintenance of good order in the principality, the extirpation of revolutionary ideology, and the punishment of revolutionary participants. Commissions dealt with the land question, vagabonds, and the availability of bread in Bucharest, and they also investigated revolutionary expenditure and participation. Several revolutionaries penned accounts of the Wallachian Revolution during their years in exile, but the first real historical research was conducted by the counterrevolutionary commissions.[230] The commission charged with researching revolutionary expenditure related to the visit of Suleiman Pasha provided a breakdown of every leu spent on the ball in his honour. Seven thousand lei was spent on building the ballroom, 12897 lei on its decoration, 1,355 lei on lighting, and 6,000 lei on food for the buffet, but the most significant research on the revolution was that conducted by the commission investigating its participants.[231] The commission followed all available leads. It requested registers of revolutionary government activity that included printing contracts, orders for the manufacture of tricolour flags, and the

[226] ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 113 & 220.
[227] ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 110.
[228] ANIC, 601/1/1848, 198.
[229] See chapter 2.
[230] See, for instance, Radulesco, *Mémoires.*
[231] BAR, Mss Rom 3861, 478v-479r.

moving of departmental operations to the revolutionary government's headquarters.[232] Treasury accounts were studied for the names of those who received government salaries, revolutionary proclamations and newspapers were read, and lists of deputies from the Property Commission and officers from General Gheorghe Magheru's army were all examined to identify suspects.[233] No stone could be left unturned in the attempts to eradicate the vestiges of the revolution.

The creation of the commission to investigate revolutionary participants was a source of tension between Russian and Ottoman officials. Fuad had made the Sultan's opposition to recrimination clear from the beginning, but General Duhamel was a relentless advocate of punishment, and little more than a month after the occupation of Bucharest Robert Colquhoun reported that it seemed certain a commission would soon be named to investigate the revolution. It would consist of five people: a representative from each of the two imperial powers and three native Wallachians. Both Colquhoun and Henri de Ségur doubted the merits of the Wallachians who were chosen. Colquhoun considered them 'as bad a choice as could be made.' He could 'easily foresee the spirit which will preside at the sittings of the commission.'[234] It was unlikely to meet the Ottoman preference for forgiveness. Ségur described one member of the commission as a 'creature of Prince Bibescu,' and the other two both had strong links with the Russians.[235] Fuad insisted that he would never consent to the commission's work, and his objections may have tempered its scope. Only two crimes were examined. Participation in the outbreak of revolution in June wasn't considered, and nor was the suppression of Odobescu's attempted coup or the destruction of property after the second failed counterrevolution. The commission's remit was limited to the burning of the Organic Regulations and the book of boyar ranks in September and the defence of Bucharest against the Ottoman invasion. The chosen crimes emphasised the imperial dimension of the counterrevolution. One was directed against Russian authority and the other against the Ottomans.[236]

---

[232] See, for instance, the records from the Interior Department at ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 71-82.
[233] For propagandists, see the request at *Anul 1848,* V, 496 and the list at ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 59 & 63. For other government documents sought, see ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 58-91 & 101-106; ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 148-160 (officers); For the request for peasant lists, see *Anul 1848,* V, 514-515. For the lists, see ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 67.
[234] Colquhoun to Stratford Canning, 27 October 1848. TNA, FO 78/743, 188r.
[235] The creature of Prince Bibescu was Mihail Cornescu, and the two men with links to the Russians were Charles Ghica and the Polish Colonel Garbasky, who had spent several years serving with the Russian army. Ségur to Aupick, 8 December 1848. CAD, 166PO/E/168.
[236] Duhamel's initial letter proposing the commission made no specific reference to these two crimes. Instead it targeted 'des délits commis en Valachie depuis le 11 (23) juin de cette année, dans le but de bouleverser les institutions du pays.' See *Anul 1848,* IV, 658-659.

But despite its limited remit the commission cast its investigative net widely when examining suspects, and it took its time to evaluate all the available evidence. The standard response given to the Bucharest police force when it requested information on passport applicants spoke to the methodical nature of the commission's workings. An applicant's name might not have come up yet, but the commissioners couldn't be certain that it wouldn't until they had completed their research. Frustrated prisoners begged to be brought for examination as soon as possible to prove their innocence. Eight men held at Văcărești petitioned the commission in December. They had been held for three months without being sentenced or even told why they had been arrested. They claimed to have played no part in the revolution, and they sought the opportunity to prove their innocence and return to their families, but the commission wouldn't be rushed.[237] It examined all available evidence and interrogated suspects before filing reports. The eighteen-year-old Tache Grigorescu, a state employee from Pitești, was released into the custody of his parents. He had been seventeen at the time of the revolution, and forty-eight people signed a letter certifying that he had not participated in any revolutionary disturbance. His only involvement was as a secretary for the city tribunal and a revolutionary club.[238] Not all men who could provide guarantees from their peers enjoyed the leniency that benefited Grigorescu. The twenty-nine-year-old Ioan Ionescu of Bucharest presented the commission with a certificate of his good conduct both during and before the revolution. It was signed by a number of residents of the city. He told the commission that he had lost his wife and most of his fortune in the fire of 1847, and he clung to government employment as the sole means to provide for his family. The commission's members were not swayed. Copies of several government proclamations as well as a stamped document naming him a propaganda commissar in Gorj County were found in his possession. The evidence suggested that he was a committed revolutionary, and the commission denied his request to be released under caution to settle his annual accounts with the commercial tribunal.[239] Provisional verdicts were also subject to review if new information came to light. The twenty-eight-year-old Costache Petrescu of Craiova claimed to have been sick with cholera for most of the revolutionary summer. He said he had been present at the burning of the Organic Regulations in the city in September, but he had only ventured out because he heard music and saw people gathering near the city's school. The commission accepted his defence and released him in May 1849, but new evidence emerged two months

[237] ANIC, 601/1/1848, I, 122.
[238] ANIC, 601/4/1849, 6. Grigorescu's father was an established merchant in the city.
[239] ANIC, 601/6/1848, 11.

later, and he was apprehended again. Reports from local authorities had arrived characterising Petrescu as a revolutionary in spirit and deed. He had stirred up villagers to help him remove the director of the quarantine at Calafat, but when he heard of the imminent Ottoman invasion he had ripped his revolutionary scarf from his throat and fled in fear.[240] The new evidence didn't mention his involvement in the burning of the Organic Regulations, but it recast his claims to have been an innocent follower of the crowds and the music.

Released prisoners were not allowed to leave Bucharest while the commission's work was ongoing, and this restriction connected the maintenance of post-revolutionary order to the investigation and punishment of revolutionary participants. Petrescu's rearrest was unusual, but all prisoners who were released were subject to restrictions on their movement to prevent them from disappearing into the country's interior or crossing the border before the commission had finished its work. One Grigorie Vladoianu appealed to General Duhamel's benevolence in April 1849. He had been arrested, interrogated, and released on bail. The allegations against him are unclear. His case file doesn't survive, although a document from early September indicates that he was involved in the National guard.[241] 'Misfortune,' wrote Vladoianu, 'has cruelly struck my family.' His mother had died of cholera and left his four orphan sisters with no means of support save him. He begged dispensation to return to his sisters. He was the eldest, he wrote, and it was left to him to manage the family lands and affairs, which he could not do from the capital.[242] The outcome of Vladoianu's appeal has also disappeared, but the insistence that he not leave Bucharest until the commission had finished its research reveals the assiduous nature of the investigations into revolutionary participants. The punishment of revolutionaries was connected to the maintenance of post-revolutionary order. It was a matter of removing their influence from society, and keeping released prisoners under police watch in Bucharest meant that they could be rearrested if new evidence came to light. Innocence could only be proven once the commission had exhausted its research.

Many arrestees claimed ignorance in defence of their actions during the summer. Costache Petrescu wasn't the only man who told the commission that he had just been following the crowds. Ten men swore that the sixty-year-old Vasile Dancovici of Bucharest had only attended the burning of the Organic Regulations in the Wallachian capital because

[240] ANIC, 601/47/1849, 2-3 & 22.
[241] *Anul 1848,* III, 750.
[242] ANIC, 601/1/1848, IV, 541. 'Le malheur a frappé bien cruellement ma famille.'

one of the Brătianu brothers had gone from shop to shop in the mercantile district of Lipscani and told the shopkeepers that an Ottoman firman was about to be read to the people in front of the Metropolitan Church.[243] Several of the peasants arrested in Teleorman County said they hadn't known what the Organic Regulations were when they participated in the burning. One Stan Opaina said that he had been out in the fields when they were burnt, and on his return, 'not knowing the book, I put a mark by my name to show my support.' He and his peers were all released under guarantees of good behaviour unless General Duhamel saw fit to punish them further, but better educated people were less lucky.[244] The twenty-eight-year-old schoolteacher of Buzău County, Costache Ciochinescu, said that he had only been following orders when he took part in the revolution, but the commission was unmoved. 'Each man,' its verdict recorded, 'is responsible for his own actions.'[245]

The ongoing crisis in Transylvania affected the commission's work. During the refugee crisis in early 1849 it brought several suspects back under their jurisdiction. Florian Aaron wasn't the only former schoolteacher and revolutionary who fled the Hungarian advance. Ioan Gherman did, too. Both men were apprehended and interrogated by the commission.[246] But the greatest impact of the Transylvanian crisis came during the summer. Russian troops crossed the border into Transylvania in June 1849, and one month later the commission wrapped up its investigations. It had spent 164,539 lei and 16 parales in the course of its work, and it passed its records to the Department of Justice to be archived.[247] Guilty verdicts were referred to General Duhamel to decide upon punishment, but Russian attention was now turned towards the Hungarian crisis, and sentencing was delegated to a special criminal court. More than ninety people had been brought before the commission in Bucharest. Only twenty-four were referred to the criminal court. Five were sentenced to spend six years in forced labour at Giurgiu, six were condemned to imprisonment in Snagov Monastery, and the other thirteen were acquitted.[248] The commission had referred people on the grounds of revolutionary involvement. The criminal court considered only the two initially agreed crimes. Costache Ciochinescu, whose claim that he was only following orders was rejected by the commission, was among the acquitted. There was no evidence to connect him to the

[243] ANIC, 601/61/1849, 8.
[244] ANIC, 601/6/1849, 3r. '…și neștiind carte, am pus degetul la numele mieu, spre încredințare.'
[245] ANIC, 601/46/1849, 5. 'fie care fiind răspunzător înparte pentru faptele sale.'
[246] For Aaron's case file, see ANIC, 601/54/1849; For Ioan Gherman's file, see ANIC, 601/62/1849.
[247] For the expenditure of the commission, see BAR, Mss Rom 3869, 103. For Mihail Cornescu's note on the conclusion of the commission's work, see BAR, Mss Rom 3869, 77.
[248] Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 478-479.

burning of the Organic Regulations or the defence of Bucharest against the Ottomans.[249] Such leniency might not have been possible had the Russians been focused solely on Wallachia.

The persecution of former revolutionaries trailed off during the 1850s as Russian interest and influence in the principality waned. Angela Jianu suggested that Prince Barbu Știrbei had thwarted Duhamel's 'vindictive zeal' in preventing the punishment of more revolutionary suspects, but the failure to prosecute more than eleven men owed as much to the changing geopolitical priorities of Russia.[250] Știrbei issued a number of pardons upon his accession, and two further rounds followed in September 1850 and March 1851.[251] Some of the convicted had already suffered greatly by then. Ioan Rotescu was sentenced to six years in Snagov Monastery, but a little over a year after his incarceration his mother requested his release. He had developed a chronic condition and did not have long to live. She wished to be with him when he died. The request was granted, but another plea for clemency was met with a harder heart.[252] The Interior Ministry informed Știrbei in March 1850 that one Anastasie Macoveiu, who was imprisoned in Mărgineni Monastery, was dying. It recommended he be allowed to spend 'the few days of his life that remain in the bosom of his family, [but] if he should recover, then he should be returned to Mărgineni.'[253] Exiles also pleaded to return to their homelands. Ion Filipescu and Marin Serghiescu both sought permission in 1852. Neither man was among the thirty-four revolutionaries sentenced to exile, but both had fled after the fall of the revolution. If allowed to return, then they promised to live quiet lives and not get involved in politics.[254] Nicolae Bălcescu died before he could see his Wallachian homeland, and both Alexandru G. Golescu and the former Bucharest police chief Mărgărit Moșoiu remained in exile until at least 1855. Dumitru Brătianu and Nicolae and Ștefan Golescu had to wait until 1857 to receive passports to return home.[255] Reconciliation between the Wallachian government and the exiled revolutionaries took close to a decade to achieve, and when the men of 1848 returned home they found that a great many changes had taken place during their absence.

---

[249] *Anul 1848,* VI, 251-252.
[250] Jianu, *Circle of Friends,* 104.
[251] BAR, Mss Rom 3898, 257-258; BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/11, 117 & 142. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* VI, 306 & 307.
[252] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/11, 115-116. Most of this file was also reprod. in Andrei Pippidi, 'Repatrierea exilaților după revoluția din 1848 din Țara Românească', *Revista Arhivelor* 2 (2008), 328-362.
[253] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/ii, 100. '…să-și săvârșească puținele zile de viață ce i-au mai rămas în sânul familiei sale, cu condiție însă că, la întâmplare de a se întrema, să se întoarca la Mărgineni.'
[254] *Anul 1848,* V, 297; Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 469-470; BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/11, 27-31.
[255] BNR, Fond Saint-Georges P LVI/11, 7, 39 & 53.

Reform

The post-revolutionary regime could not rely solely on discipline and punishment to prevent a future revolutionary upheaval. It needed to check some of the excesses of the pre-revolutionary order and offer hope for a better future. Christopher Clark described this era in European politics as one characterised by a 'technocratic vision of progress.' Governments legitimised themselves through their 'capacity to stimulate and maintain economic growth.' Borrowing a phrase from Geoffrey Elton's study of the Tudor era, Clark suggests that the 1850s saw a European 'revolution in government.'[256] The Wallachian case aligns with much of what Clark saw in France, the German states, Spain, Portugal, and elsewhere, but it also provides opportunities to consider the intellectual links between the revolutionaries and their successors in government and the new temporal order that defined the post-revolutionary period. Progress needed to be detached from politics. In their pre-revolutionary writings, many of the figures who would play prominent roles during the summer of 1848 had written of the future of Wallachia and how the principality could learn from the more advanced states of Western Europe. The outbreak of revolution offered an opportunity to connect that better future to the political present.[257] The post-revolutionary regime tried to break that link. It considered a better future to be a means to avoid the politicisation of the present, and it sought to contain local grievances within their localities, rather than allowing them to unite to become regional or even national issues. None of the measures adopted after the Ottoman occupation of Bucharest in September 1848 was anything like as radical as the proposals of the Islaz Proclamation. The revolutionary programme had been the most ambitious and far-reaching plan for reform in Wallachian history. The schemes that followed were more modest. While some states saw the growth of a free press during this period, Wallachia did not. Ranks and titles returned, and the new Wallachian Criminal Code of 1850 employed the use of both corporal and capital punishment. Some of the new measures were programmatic. Others were piecemeal and ad hoc, but they still represented an attempt to move beyond the pre-revolutionary social and political order and mitigate the possibility of a second revolution.

Events across Europe during the spring had spooked conservative figures in the principality, and talk of reform predated the outbreak of revolution in June. The son of the

[256] Clark, 'After 1848', 171-174.
[257] See chapter 1.

former Prince Grigore IV Ghica, Dimitrie, had engaged with the liberal party in Wallachia during the spring. 'Like the rest of you,' he wrote in a letter to the editor of *Popolul Suveran* in August, 'I thought that reforms were needed after the immense commotion of February… and that this was perhaps the only means of preventing a tumultuous popular movement that would bring incalculable damage to the country.'[258] The revolutionary leaders saw the events in Paris as a symbol of hope. Dimitrie Ghica considered them a warning beacon. He spent the summer in exile in Brașov and only returned to Wallachia after the revolutionary government had fallen. The Russian reformer Pavel Kiselev was another man to recognise the need for reform. Kiselev was the architect of the Organic Regulations, and he watched the revolution's progress from Saint Petersburg with sadness. The problem, he felt, lay in the exercise of the law. Prince Bibescu and his local officials had strayed from the path that he had laid out, and it was these deviations that led to revolution. He wrote a memorandum in late July advocating the revision of the Organic Regulations, 'especially concerning their application.' The law wasn't wrong or bad in itself, but changes were needed to ensure that it was observed correctly.[259] Kiselev's thinking evolved over the summer. This first intervention in July focused on ways to restore the old order, but in August he proposed more far-reaching reforms. The problem lay in the connection between private interest and public office. The Wallachian General Assembly was comprised exclusively of boyars who were exempt from taxation, and they—along with the prince and the archbishops—were all landowners. 'Private interest,' Kiselev wrote, 'is the only motive that drives them.' He recommended the return of seven-year terms of office for the prince and the modification of the judicial system to align it with the Russian one. But the most significant change he suggested concerned the improvement of the peasant's lot.[260]

The revolution had exposed the tensions in the agrarian order of the principality, and the consequences became clear after 25 September. Complaints inundated the new government. Peasants across the principality had refused to observe their traditional labour obligations during the summer, and landowners and tenant farmers demanded

---

[258] BNR, Fond Brătianu XXXVIII/4c, 1r. '…j'ai cru, comme la plupart d'autre vous, qu'à la suite de l'immense commotion de février, il y avait chez nous des reformes à opérer, des abus a réduction, et j'ai même pensé que c'était là peut-être l'unique moyen de prévenir des mouvements populaires tumultueux qui, en attirant sur le pays d'incalculables calamités, nous feraient rétrograder au lieu de nous pousser vers le progrès.' ; See Chapter Two for a more detailed discussion.

[259] Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 197-199. 'De s'entendre avec la Porte sur la révision de règlement surtout en ce qui concerne son application, et de rendre plus difficiles à l'avenir les déviations que les Hospodars et les administrations locales se sont permises au préjudice des contribuables.'

[260] Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 237-239. 'Le Hospodar et les évêques étant aussi propriétaires fonciers, l'intérêt privé de tous est le seul mobile qui les dirige.'

compensation. Anica Filipescu of Bucharest claimed that the peasants of her Buzău estate had hunted on her lands, grazed their cattle on her fields, cut down her forests and orchards for firewood, and emptied her ponds of its fish. The Buzău governor investigated Filipescu's grievances and found her claims credible, and his counterparts in Mehedinți and Ilfov relayed similar claims over the following weeks.[261] Peasants across the principality had left crops to rot in the fields, grazed their livestock on the manorial reserve, and fished and gathered firewood without landowner permission.[262] One Dumitru Cernea of Ilfov County had even seen the peasants of his Ulmeni estate raze his house to the ground. Local government research revealed that one hundred people had taken part in the destruction.[263] The new regime blamed peasant insubordination on its revolutionary predecessor. The peasants had been moved by the propagandists of the illegitimate government and animated by the 'communist principle.'[264] Tenant farmers bore the heaviest burden. Their contracts with landowners had been concluded before the revolution began, and most farmers had paid their leases in full during the spring. They had expected to recover their costs once the harvest came in, but the peasants' refusal to work the fields had ruined them. Some had begged, exhorted, and even bribed the peasants to perform their traditional labours, but few had listened, and crops were lost to the rains.[265] The next round of lease payments was due in April 1849, and none of the tenants who petitioned Cantacuzino and Fuad had the money to pay. They begged the government to annul their contracts or organise restitution.[266]

Landowner and tenant farmer compensation was a means of coming to terms with the legacy of the revolution. The government first directed local officials to investigate cases in October 1848.[267] All allegations were to be treated thoroughly and impartially, but the burden of these investigations was enormous. The governor of Dolj County wrote of his difficulties in a report to the Interior Department in January 1849. There were too many cases to handle, and he requested permission to appoint two men in each district who could investigate the claims. He wrote that he would choose men of faith and good character, and that he would only consider landowners for the task.[268] The Interior Department adopted the

[261] BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 117-119 (for Filipescu's case) & 95 & 183 for examples from Mehedinți and Ilfov.
[262] For landowner complaints from 1848-1849, see BAR, Mss Rom 3886 & 3887. See, for instance, BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 86-87, which refers to peasants fishing and grazing their livestock without permission. See BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 68 for peasants leaving crops in the fields.
[263] BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 299-300.
[264] BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 162; BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 138. 'prințipul comunismului'
[265] BAR, Mss Rom 3892, 241r.
[266] For tenant farmer complaints, see BAR, Mss Rom 3892, 241-253 & 268.
[267] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 94.
[268] BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 267.

governor's idea for the whole country. A month after his request it directed all local governors to appoint commissions to research complaints. They were to be comprised of three members, all of whom had to come from the ranks of the landowning boyar class of the county.[269] The choice was meant to ensure full landowner confidence in the work, though several local governors faced difficulties in filling the posts. Some appointees claimed to be too ill to serve, and others never replied to local government requests.[270] Investigations moved slowly. The Interior Department informed the new Prince Barbu Știrbei in June 1849 that several counties still lacked commissions. His advice was sought on how to proceed in 'an epoch such as this, when every Wallachian is bound to contribute to righting the wrongs of the recent events.'[271] Compensation was not only a matter of financial restitution. It was a means to move beyond the revolutionary order and gain the confidence of the established classes of society. Most cases were resolved in favour of the landowners and tenant farmers, although some losses were considered to have been exaggerated, and compensation was adjusted accordingly.[272]

Compensation dealt with the complaints of landowners and tenant farmers, but land reform was needed to prevent future peasant unrest. The importance of land reform for social harmony was widely recognised. The revolutionaries had transformed local grievances into a national concern and exposed the problems in the Wallachian countryside. Fuad was not alone in believing that the material improvement of the principality was needed to avoid future unrest. Dimitrie Ghica wrote of the necessity to improve the lot of the peasant in a reform programme addressed to the Ottoman and Russian officials in Wallachia after the revolution. Landowner rapacity had brought hardship and suffering. 'It is very rare,' Ghica wrote, for a peasant to succeed in 'preserving the nest egg which he amasses by the sweat of his brow.' The uncertainty led many peasants to neglect their obligations, and it broke the compact between landowner and peasant. Only one party profited from the land regime as it

---

[269] BAR, Mss Rom 3886, 334-335.

[270] For appointments, see BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 4-17. For examples of claims of illness, see BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 289 (Ilfov) and BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 413 (Dolj); for no response, see BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 398 (Slam-Râmnic).

[271] BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 359v. 'Această împrejurare supuind'o departamentul la cunoștința înălțimei Voastre să roagă plecat să bine voiți ai porunci l^iu ce urmare să facă cu acei numți comisari ce refuzează această mică sarcină, într'o epochă ca aceasta, cînd tot rumînul este dator să contrebuească la îndreptarea vătămărilor isvorite din trecutele evenemente…'

[272] See, for instance, the detailed report on the claims of Vasile Manolescu of Buzău County at BAR, Mss Rom 3887, 552-555. For more on post-revolutionary compensation, see Corfus, *Agricultura în Țările Române, 1848-1864,* 131-148.

existed before the revolution.[273] An anonymous memoirist agreed with Ghica's verdict. He wrote that it was imperative to tackle landowner and tenant farmer abuses and to end their collusion with local government officials.[274] The counterrevolutionary government reached the same conclusion. The Interior Ministry's directive to local governments on researching complaints against required local officials to investigate landowner wrongdoings, too.[275] Even the Russian Foreign Minister Count Nesselrode recognised the need to introduce land reform. He advised Tsar Nicholas I on the future government of the two Danubian Principalities in November. Among his recommendations was the 'improvement of the peasant's state and his relations with the landowners.'[276] All parties were in agreement, and article three of the Convention of Balta Liman laid the groundwork for a commission on land reform. The pre-revolutionary agrarian order was no longer tenable.

The new government's agrarian project overhauled rather than overthrew the Organic Regulations. It was a moderate rather than radical programme. The *corvée* endured, and the peasants were not made landowners themselves. The project was pursued by the new Prince Barbu Știrbei, who took power in June 1849. His appointment wasn't welcomed by many of the prominent boyars of the principality. Robert Colquhoun reported that a 'very strong and inveterate party' had already formed against Știrbei before his appointment.[277] Știrbei was the brother of the deposed Prince Gheorghe Bibescu. He had fled Wallachia in April to avoid what he saw as the inevitable revolution that would follow the events across Europe in spring, but was not a staunch conservative.[278] Both he and his brother had been educated in Paris like the revolutionaries, although Știrbei's time coincided with the Restoration rather than the July Monarchy. In Paris he fell under the influence of the moderate French liberal François Guizot, and his politics tended towards gradual progress rather than the radical revolution. He was known in Wallachia as a competent man of enlightened sensibilities, and he served in a variety of government posts before the revolution. He worked on the commission to beautify Bucharest, participated in the translation and adaptation of the French Commercial

[273] BNR, Fond Brătianu XL/7, 11r. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 667. '…aussi est-il fort rare qu'il parvienne à conserver le pécule qu'il a amassé à la sueur de son front. Il en est résulté chez lui une habitude de paresse invincible, qui prend sa sources dans l'incertitude où le paysan se trouve presque toujours de la conservation de ses épargnes.'
[274] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCLXXXI/104. A copy of the same memoir can be found at BNR, Fond Bălcescu 131 and reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 675-678.
[275] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 94.
[276] Nesselrode to Nicholas I, 29 November 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 368-371. 'Amélioration de l'état du paysan et de ses rapports avec les propriétaires fonciers.'
[277] Colquhoun to Palmerston, 3 June 1849. TNA, FO 78/788, 69v-70r.
[278] Reported in Colquhoun to Palmerston, 7 April 1848. TNA, FO 78/742, 29.

Code, and worked to revise both the civil and criminal procedural codes of the principality.[279] Some historians have doubted his commitment to the cause of land reform. Anastasie Iordache noted that he had scrapped the commission to investigate land reform appointed by his predecessor, Constantin Cantacuzino, and replaced it in October 1849 with a new one composed solely of great boyars.[280] But Cantacuzino himself was one of those seven great boyars that Știrbei appointed, and there were other proofs of his interest in the land question. In 1831, Știrbei had been the only man in the Wallachian Assembly to oppose a reduction in the amount of land made available to peasants, and he promoted land reform in a document sent to General Duhamel at the beginning of 1849.[281] Știrbei was working in the context of the Ottoman-Russian occupation of the principality, and it's unlikely that any commission would have proposed more radical reforms. The final report was subject to Russian and Ottoman approval. It was delivered it to Știrbei in March 1850, and he sent copies to both Fuad and Duhamel for the Sultan and the Tsar's approval.[282] The reform programme reaffirmed several of the principles of the Organic Regulations. The landowner was the master of his estates, and the peasant was the master of his person and his labour.[283] Relations between the two parties were based upon consent, and legislation governing the amount of land available to a peasant for his personal use was only meant to be temporary. It would be replaced once landowners and peasants were better able to value their land and their labour. Until that day came, the commission's project established how much land a peasant should receive. It was based on the number of animals that he owned, which governed the utility of his labour to the landowner. A peasant with four oxen could provide greater service to the landlord than a peasant with two oxen or none, and so he received more land than his peers, but every peasant was guaranteed a fixed amount of land for his house, courtyard, and family vegetable patch. The figure was set at around 1,500 square metres in the plains and 1,150 square metres in the mountains, which were the same allocations as those contained in the Organic Regulations, although the amount of land made available for peasant livestock was

[279] For Știrbei's biography, see Cornel I. Scafeș & Vladimir Zodian, *Barbu Știrbei (1849-1865)*, (Bucharest: Editura militară, 1981), esp. 1-73 for his early life.
[280] Iordache, *Principatele Române,* 241-242.
[281] On Știrbei and land reform, see Emerit, *Les Paysans Roumains,* 322-356; Știrbei's memorial on reforms—along with Duhamel's objections to his ideas—is reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 399-409; Several members of the commission were confirmed conservatives, including Apostol Arsache, who was its chairman, and Barbu Catargiu, who later served as Prime Minister under Alexandru Ioan Cuza. For the full list of names and the decree establishing the commission, see BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 116v.
[282] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 156. 'Je prie V. Exc. de vouloir bien soumettre ce travail à la Sublime Porte dont j'attendrai les décisions à ce sujet.'
[283] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 135v. '…proprietarul este stăpînu cu desăvîrșire pe pămîntulu său, asemenea și săteanulu este stăpînu cu desăvîrșire pe sinecu și pe munca sa.'

doubled.[284] The scheme was approved by both the Ottomans and the Russians in 1851, and it came into force on 5 May 1852. The delay was to allow people to read and understand the new regulations.

Peasant-landlord relations in the post-revolutionary period were subject to an expanded administrative order. Abuses had been common under the Organic Regulations, and the state had done little to exercise regulatory oversight. Peasants under the old order were required to work twelve days a year on their landlords' estates, but the definition of a day's labour varied. It wasn't determined by the passage of the sun across the firmament. The Organic Regulations stipulated the amount of work that should be done in a day, but landowners often ignored this and set their own targets. Marcel Emerit estimated that those twelve days were more often thirty-two, and the Organic Regulations didn't stipulate the time of year when labour days had to be performed. The greatest burdens were imposed during the harvest, and peasants' own crops rotted in the fields while they worked their landowners' fields.[285] The agrarian law of 1851 increased the number of working days to twenty, but it also set specific guidelines to govern them. Six days were to be served in spring, seven days during summer, and the final seven in autumn. The definition of a day's labour from the Organic Regulations remained, but landowners were to be held accountable for their calculations by the deputies of the village. Every evening a landowner was required to deliver a list of the names of the men who were expected to work the following day to the village deputies. At the end of each day worked, a peasant would receive a ticket certifying that he had performed his labours.[286] The twelve days of the Organic Regulations might have amounted to 365 days in the year, as Karl Marx's drunk boyar had it in *Das Kapital*, but after May 1852 twenty days meant twenty days.[287]

Local grievances under the new agrarian law were to be kept local. The revolutionaries had transformed the agrarian question into a matter of national concern with the Islaz

---

[284] Specifically: 400 square *stânjeni* in the plains and 300 square *stânjeni* in the mountains. The length of a *stânjen* varied over time and between the two principalities, but the legislation specified the use of the *stânjen* introduced by Șerban Vodă, which was equal to roughly 1.97 metres. See BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 147r-148r. For the printed law see BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 218r-v. The full legislative programme with Știrbei's instructions to various departments is at BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 217-231; *Regulamentul Organic întrupat cu legiurile din anii 1831, 1832 și 1833, și adăogat la sfârșit cu legiurile de la anul 1834 până acum, împărțită pe fie-care an, precum și cu o scară deslușită a materiilor. Acum a doa oară tipărit cu slobozenia Înaltei Stăpâniri în zilele prea înălțatului Prinț și Domn Stăpânitor a toată Țara Românească, Gheorghie D. Bibescu BB,* (Bucharest, 1847), 75. A French-language manuscript version can be found in the archives of the Jagiellonian Library in Krakow, Poland at Biblioteka Jagiellońska (BJ), Berol. Ms. Gall. Fol. 166 [digitised at https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/366592/edition/349603/content?ref=desc accessed 20 March 2019].

[285] See chapter 3; for the Organic Regulations, see Article 141 at *Regulamentul Organic*, 76-78.

[286] BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 149v-150r.

[287] Marx, *Capital*, I, 348.

Proclamation. It brought the condition of the peasantry to Bucharest with the introduction of the Land Commission in August, but the new law of 1851 created local structures to deal with local grievances. It was an attempt to prevent small-scale disagreements from spilling over onto the national stage. Kiselev had first attempted to introduce panels of lay judges in villages across Wallachia with the Organic Regulations, but the positions were immediately filled with peasants who exercised their new powers to arrest boyars, stage mock trials, and sentence them to punishments including 'decapitation,' and Kiselev soon retracted the measure.[288] The law of 1851 revisited local justice. Article 143 of the Organic Regulations was dedicated solely to the landowner's interests. It specified that each year the peasants were obliged to choose four men for every one hundred families to serve as tithe collectors, rangers, masters of the cellars, wheelwrights, and the like.[289] The revised Article 143 established a village council formed of a representative of the landowner, two village deputies, and an administrator to be elected by the peasants themselves. The council couldn't sentence boyars to death. It was responsible for overseeing the village funds and grain reserves, recruiting gendarmes, and investigating civil disputes between the landowner and the peasants. The change shifted the balance away from the landowner's interests and towards those of the peasants without providing an opportunity to disrupt the social order.[290] Stirbei's programme was not as radical as that proposed by the revolutionaries, but it sought a balance between the competing interests of the two sides and attempted to rectify the problems of the old Organic Regulations. In doing so, it established local ways to deal with local grievances. Peasant unrest could not be a matter of national significance again.

It's unclear how successful the modest land reforms of 1851 were in practice, but the post-revolutionary government's commitment to the agrarian question shouldn't be doubted. The most detailed historical work on the agricultural order of the two Danubian Principalities in the nineteenth century was conducted by Ilie Corfus. His study of agriculture between 1848 and the abolition of the *corvée* in 1864 is mostly rigorous and well-researched. He was one of the few historians during the Communist era who grounded his work in archival sources, but the section on the application of the law of 1851 contains only a few references to

---

[288] See Bitis, *Russia and the Eastern Question,* 449.

[289] BJ, Berol. Ms. Gall. Fol. 166, 118. 'Le propriétaire sera tenu d'employer les hommes qui lui seront donnés en service, sur la terre même où ils auraient leur résidence, et seulement à des services ordinaires et usités, tels que ceux de percepteur de dîmes, de gardes-forestiers, de maîtres de caves, de charrons et autres pareils.'; for the Romanian see *Regulamentul Organic,* 84.

[290] The draft version is slightly different from the final published version. This description comes from the official legislative project at BAR, Mss Rom 3838, 220v. Historians who have discussed Știrbei's reform project have ignored this change. See, for instance, Nicolae Iorga, *Viața și Domnia lui Barbu Dimitrie Știrbei, Domn al Țerii-Românești (1849-1856),* (Vălenii-de-Munte: Neamul Românesc, 1910), 54-61.

general works on agriculture in Moldavia and not a single reference to a contemporary source.[291] Further research in regional archives is needed to establish how the law of 1851 affected peasant-landlord relations, but Știrbei's government also pursued a variety of other strategies to improve agricultural during his reign. He sent agents into the countryside to investigate whether the Russian and Ottoman armies had followed the correct procedures when requisitioning food, and under his patronage the ad hoc agricultural school at Pantelimon in Bucharest became the National School of Agriculture. It recruited students from across the country so that they could transmit the knowledge they gained to their communities, and Știrbei employed the Italian agronomist Ugo Calindri to give the institution a European outlook.[292] Agricultural output increased dramatically during his reign. The value of exported grain and cattle rose from 7.75 million lei in 1850 to 29.97 million lei in 1855. But peasant unrest also continued. There were revolts in Ialomița, Ilfov, Vlașca, Teleorman, Romanați, Dolj, and Mehedinți during his time in office, but these were locally contained.[293] The next major nationwide peasant revolt wouldn't come until 1907, long after the *corvée* had been abolished and the two Danubian Principalities united.

The question of Roma slavery was dealt with on an ad-hoc basis prior to its final abolition in 1856. Fuad and Cantacuzino reversed the abolition of slavery on 10 October. Their decree stated that those slaves who had been freed by the good will of their former owners could stay free, but those whose owners were coerced by the revolutionary government were to return to their masters.[294] Matters were more complicated in practice. The new government continued to buy freedom for Roma slaves and move gradually towards full emancipation. Records from 1849 show that it spent over 1.5 million lei to free 4,893 slaves, and the following year the slave trade was ended. [295] The final abolition of slavery in 1856 was accomplished with far greater administrative competence than the revolutionary government had demonstrated in its own attempts to end the practice. Some 6.5 million lei was spent to free the principality's fifty-thousand slaves.[296] The post-revolutionary

---

[291] Corfus, *Agricultura în Țările Române, 1848-1864,* 164-182.
[292] Apostol Stan, 'Elemente de modernitate ale agriculturii românești, 1831-1864', *Revista Istorică*, II (1991), 369-381, 375.
[293] Scafeș, *Barbu Știrbei,* 92-93.
[294] BAR, Mss Rom 3867, 6. Also reprod. in *Anul 1848,* IV, 572.
[295] Figures taken from BAR, Mss Rom 3852, 65. See also BAR, Mss Rom 3852, 56-139; See Raluca Tomi, 'Mișcarea abolițională din principatești impactul ei asupra legislației de dezrobire (1849-1856)', *Revista Istorică* XXI (2010), 57-71.
[296] See BAR, Mss Rom 3852, 198. For the draft legislation, see BAR, Mss Rom 3852, 154-155 & 163-165. The costs associated with the abolition of slavery up to 1858 can be found at BAR, Mss Rom 3852, 329v-330r. Note: the final figure does include expenses that dated from before the final abolition; Venera Achim, 'Emanciparea țiganilor și programul legislative al guvernului provizoriu din 1848', *Revista Istorică*, XX (2009), 63-72.

government hadn't rejected the revolutionary ideal of abolition. It had only delayed its implementation and pursued it as a gradual process.[297]

Greater oversight of administrative officials was exercised by the post-revolutionary government, and it took steps to end administrative abuses. Corrupt officials were common during the reign of Prince Gheorghe Bibescu. These men were one of the principal targets of the Islaz Proclamation, which demanded responsible ministers and public officials. The Provisional Government began to reshape local offices in its image in June, and the work to overhaul local government continued throughout the summer.[298] Even those who opposed the revolution recognised the problem of abuses. Public office had been seen not as a means to serve the general interest, but as an opportunity for patronage. Both Dimitrie Ghica and the anonymous memoirist of October 1848 wrote of the need to improve the character of public officials and eradicate corruption. 'Abuses might not have driven the Wallachians to revolt,' wrote the anonymous memoirist, but they facilitated the exploitation of popular opinion by the revolutionary factions.[299] Corrupt local officials were easy targets for revolutionary propaganda, and they offered another opportunity to turn local grievances into national political problems. The counterrevolutionary regime needed to separate the local from the national. Some men regained the offices they had held before June 1848, but corrupt and incompetent officials were identified and removed from office, while central government exercised a tighter watch on the workings of local officials. Approval was needed for new appointments, and governors had to provide updated lists of their subordinates on a regular basis, providing explanations when offices changed hands.[300] The governor of Dolj reported in November 1848 that he had reinstated most of the men who held office prior to the revolution, but he replaced the man in charge of the district of Jiului-de-Jos as he was known to be 'weak and inactive in his duties.'[301] The same governor had to replace two other local officials a year later after they were discovered to have stolen money.[302] Effingham Grant was unimpressed by the calibre of men the new regime appointed. In a letter to Ion

---

[297] For more on the abolitionist movement during this period, see Raluca Tomi, 'Mișcarea abolițională din principatesi impactul ei asupra legislației de dezrobire (1849-1856)', *Revista Istorică* XXI (2010), 57-71.
[298] See chapter 3.
[299] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCLXXXI/104. 'Ces abus ont, si non poussé les Valaques a la révolte, mais facilité a quelques factieux l'exploitation des esprits qui ne sachant, ni d'ou leur venaient leur souffrances ni comment ils pourraient les alléger, ont cru des hommes qui leur parlaient au nom de principes qu'ils couvraient des mots de justice et de fraternité.'
[300] See BAR, Mss Rom 3883, 8-84 for a variety of examples from the immediate aftermath of the revolution; for 1850, see BAR, Mss Rom 3884, 434-512.
[301] BAR, Mss Rom 3883, 133. '…schimbare numai unuia dintrînșii, și anume Alecu Giroceanu dela Plasa Jiului de jos, cele ce cunoscundusă slab și neactiv în lucrările sale…'
[302] BAR, Mss Rom 3884, 49-50.

Ghica in October 1849, he wrote that the only thing that was happening in the principalities was 'a general change in the prefects, and all the choices are for the worse.'[303] Grant may not have liked the new men, and it would be going too far to suggest that the changes represented a sustained attack on administrative abuses, but it's clear that the post-revolutionary government recognised the damage that abuses could do in uniting local grievances with national causes, and it worked to mitigate that threat in the future.

Legal reform was needed to provide a stronger juridical basis for the new order in Wallachia, and it was designed to reinforce the social order. Știrbei had demonstrated his commitment to legal reform in the pre-revolutionary era when he worked to revise the civil and criminal procedural codes of the principality. Many others recognised the need to improve the judicial system after 1848. Count Nesselrode included it in his suggestions to Tsar Nicholas on the future government of the principalities, and Dimitrie Ghica wrote that there were 'huge gaps to fill' in the penal code.[304] 'As it exists today, it is truly in a rudimentary state and contains nothing but vague measures which make its just application very difficult.'[305] The new code was introduced in December 1850. It updated its predecessor from 1841 and borrowed from the French Napoleonic Code.[306] The usual crimes against persons and property were included along with the appropriate penalties, and there were sections on crimes that threatened public order, such as vagabondage, forgery, and disobedience before public officials. Another section dealt with public morality and included articles against bigamy and prostitution.[307] Punishments were designed to reinforce the social order. Article 33 stipulated that nobles and professionals such as merchants, doctors, lawyers, and others of 'special character' should not be subject to corporal punishment. Judges 'must never lose sight of the character and social position of the person to be punished.'[308] Justice wasn't equal. The sight of a lawyer or doctor being subject to a public whipping might

---

[303] Effingham Grant to Ion Ghica, 6 October 1849. BAR, Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(62)/DCXVI. 'Rien ne se fait ici, absolument rien. Si ce n'est qu'un changement général des Préfêts, et en ceci on a fait choix de tout ce qu'il y de plus mauvais.'

[304] For Nesselrode's thoughts, see Nesselrode to Nicholas I, 29 November 1848. Reprod. in Varta, *Documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* 368-371.

[305] BNR, Fond Brătianu XL/7, 10r. '…immenses lacunes sont à combler dans le code pénal. Tel qu'il existe chez nous aujourd'hui, il n'est vraiment qu'à l'état rudimentaire et ne contient du reste que des dispositions tellement vagues que la juste application en est fort difficile.''

[306] Scafeș, *Barbu Știrbei,* 93-95.

[307] *Condica Criminală,* 83-87. See also Nicoleta Roman, 'Prostituția în orașele Țării Românești (1829-1859) ', *Revista Istorică*, XX (2009), 277-290.

[308] *Condica Criminală,* 13. 'Art. 33. Nobilul de familie, de rang, sau de profesie, precum boerii, neguțătorii, doctorii, advocații și alții cu deosebit ccaracter, nu se supun la bătae; căci bătea de și s'a priimit între pedepsele acestei condici, însă la a ei aplicație judecătorul nu va pierde nici o dată din vedere caracterul și poziția soțială a ori căruia osândit, orânduind la asemenea împrejurări, în locul acestei pedepse, tot d'auna corăspunzătoare osândă.'

endanger the existing social hierarchies, which the new code bolstered, but while punishments varied, nobody was to be exempt from the law. Procedures were laid down for investigating public officials suspected of misdeeds or crimes both inside and outside the course of their work. These men were to be judged by the High Court, unless they were an agent or procurator of that court, in which case they would be judged by the Civil or Criminal Appeals Court of Bucharest depending upon the misdeed or crime.[309]

The revolution had also exposed problems with military discipline, and new measures were adopted to ensure that the army remained loyal and became an effective apparatus of state power. The Wallachian army was demobilised in the aftermath of 25 September. Soldiers were ordered to return to their barracks and give up their horses, weapons, and other military effects.[310] The principality's good order would be left to the Russian and Ottoman armies to maintain, and in November 1848 Caimacam Cantacuzino addressed a proclamation to Wallachian soldiers. He wrote that the catastrophic revolution of June could have been avoided if members of the military had sworn a solemn oath to uphold the existing social order. It had been left to the Suzerain and Protecting Courts to deliver Wallachia from ruin, and now he placed an oath before the principality's soldiers. 'Forget the past,' he advised them, 'and look to the future. Stride with sure steps along the road of honour, armed with virtue, belief, and obedience.' The oath committed the army to the legal order of the principality as established by the Ottomans and the Russians. Those who swore it were asked to confirm that they would work for 'the legal sovereign recognised by both the High Imperial Suzerain and Protecting Courts.'[311] The Princely Lieutenancy might have had Ottoman approval, but it never won recognition from Russia. The new oath meant that the army could not support a government introduced by one power alone. It maintained the geopolitical status quo. Barbu Știrbei introduced the principality's first established system of military justice four years later.[312] It covered duelling and insubordination and instituted punishments for theft while on duty. Any soldier who stole from the dead during the course of a military operation would be punished with the maximum number of lashes.[313] Distinctions were

---

[309] *Condica Criminală,* 219-222.
[310] *Anul 1848,* V, 23-24.
[311] *Anul 1848,* V, 438-439. '…uitați trecutul și priviți viitorul, pășind cu pas sigur în Calea cinstei, armați cu virtute, cu credință, cu supunere…' & '…voiu sluji stăpânirei pravilnice, recunoscute de amăndouă înaltele împărătesci Curți Suzerane și Protectrițe…'
[312] BNR, Fond Saints Georges P CCVI/9. Also reprod. in Ioan Bujoreanu, *Collectiune de Legiuirile Romaniei vechi și nuoi cate s'au promulgatu pene la finale anului 1870. Legi, Procedure, Regulamente, Decrete, Instructiuni, Formularii, Convențiuni, Concesiuni, Statute, Circulare Instructive, Tablouri & &. Inavutita cu Pravila lui Caragea, legiuirile principelui B.D. Stirbei, Codulu Civilu Vechiu alu Moldovei (Calimach), Manualu de Pravila Bisericească și Statutele Coloniiloru Bulgare din Bassarabia,* (Bucharest, 1873), 1531-1557.
[313] BNR, Fond Saints Georges P CCVI/9, 18v.

drawn between crimes that occurred during peacetime and those that took place during times of unrest. A special supplement covered martial law. The prince had the power to declare martial law in any city, town, village, or county if a seditious party appeared there or disrupted communication within a five-mile radius, and while martial law was in effect, 'all inhabitants of the place declared in a state of siege, without distinction of rank or other condition, will be subject to military justice for their crimes or wrongs.'[314] Anybody who was found to have encouraged the inhabitants of a place under military occupation—whether he were a soldier, a civilian, or a priest—to rebel would be punished with death, regardless of whether a revolt actually broke out.[315] It was a supplement designed specifically to prevent another revolution.

But not all the ideas for reforms raised in the wake of the revolution were pursued by the new government. Both Dimitrie Ghica and the anonymous memoirist suggested measures that went unrealised. Ghica shared the revolutionaries' beliefs in a system of general taxation and the establishment of a national bank.[316] Știrbei attempted to set one up, but the project failed after negotiations for funding with Austrian bankers broke down. Another thirty years would pass before one appeared. Economic improvement, then, was on the agenda, but moral and political improvement were not. The anonymous memoirist had suggested that one of the best means to avoid a future revolutionary outbreak was the education of the people. The revolutionaries had used propaganda to embed communist ideas in the minds of the people. A counter-propaganda was the best means of eliminating such subversive ideas. 'The same means that succeeded in planting these ideas must be used to uproot them and inspire healthier ones: in a word, instead of a propaganda of rebellion, theft, and murder, we need one of submission and justice.'[317] He suggested the government name a commission of the most enlightened boyars and merchants to organise a counter-propaganda and oversee its execution. Its principal objective would be the 'moral improvement of all classes of the nation.'[318] The counterrevolutionary government preferred to suppress political dissent rather

[314] BNR, Fond Saints Georges P CCVI/9, 34v-35r. 'Toți lăcuitori locurilor declarate în stare de împresurare fără osebire de rang și alte condiții se vor judeca ostășește, pentru ale lor crime sau vini.'
[315] BNR, Fond Saints Georges P CCVI/9, 17r.
[316] For Ghica's proposal, see BNR, Fond Brătianu XL/7, 12r-v.
[317] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCLXXXI/104, 232v-233r. 'Prouver que toutes les idées de communisme répandues dans les masses ne sont nullement d'accord avec la justice, la morale et la religion. Le même moyen qui est parvenu à enraciner de pareilles idées, doit servir à les déraciner et à inspirer de plus saines, en un mot, au lieu d'une propaganda de rébellion, de vol, et de meurtre, il faut une propagande de soumission et de justice.'
[318] BAR, Doc Ist DCCCLXXXI/104, 235v. 'La mission principale de cette contre-propagande serait l'amélioration de l'état moral de toutes les classes de la nation…'

than dissuade it. Moral reform was not its objective. It focussed instead on administrative and economic improvement.

The decade after 1848 was a technocratic age of economic and industrial progress and administrative reorganisation that was interrupted only by the Crimean War. As Chris Clark has shown, governments across Europe used economic growth and investment in infrastructure to neutralise political dissent.[319] In France, Baron Haussmann began to rebuild Paris, and the relationship between cities and the state was reconceptualised in the German-speaking lands where walls were torn down and ring roads laid in their place.[320] Railway tracks crisscrossed the continent in patterns coordinated by central authorities, central statistical offices opened, and industrial development was promoted across Europe.[321] It was an age of European progress, and Barbu Știrbei's Wallachia saw similar improvements. A new educational programme was introduced in 1850 that funded four-year primary schools covering lessons in national history, economics, physics, and mathematics, and specialist institutes for technical education were also founded.[322] A School of Bridges and Highways opened in 1850 along with a training school for military doctors. A school dedicated to artisanal crafts was inaugurated in 1851, and 1853 and 1856 saw the opening of new surgical and pharmacological schools.[323] By 1852 there were specialist hospitals to treat venereal diseases in almost every county in the principality, and new administrative measures were introduced to prevent the spread of these maladies, including a requirement for all prostitutes in Bucharest to register with the city's police.[324] The military and navy were reorganised and expanded, and foreign officers were brought to teach at the principality's military academy.[325] New lanterns lit Bucharest's streets, and the year 1854 saw work begin on the first telegraph lines in Wallachia.[326] These facilitated quicker communication between the capital and the interior of the Ottoman Empire as well as Transylvania. One line linked Bucharest to Giurgiu on the Danube and Ruse across the border in Bulgaria, and the other line connected Bucharest to Ploiești and Brașov.[327] The introduction of a railway network was also proposed,

---

[319] See Clark, 'After 1848', 173-188.
[320] On Haussmann's transformation of Paris, see David P. Jordan, 'Haussmann and *Haussmannisation:* The Legacy for Paris', *French Historical Studies* 27.1 (2004), 87-113; On the German cities, see Yair Mintzker, *The Defortification of the German City, 1699-1866,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 225-255.
[321] For a study on the rise of statistics, see Patriarca, *Numbers and Nationhood.*
[322] Scafeș, *Barbu Știrbei,* 99. Dimtrie Ghica had proposed a similar scheme. See BNR, Fond Brătianu XL/7, 12v-13r.
[323] Hitchins, *Romanians*, 276; Scafeș, *Barbu Știrbei,* 101.
[324] Roman, "Prostituția în orașele Țării Românești', 283-286.
[325] Scafeș, *Barbu Știrbei,* 116-120.
[326] For figures on streetlamps see BNR, Fond Brătianu XII/1, 178.
[327] Scafeș, *Barbu Știrbei,* 97.

but Știrbei's attempts to find funding in Munich in 1855 failed. The principality's financial shortcomings owed a great deal to the burden of the Russian occupation. The Ottomans had paid their own way, but the Russians insisted that Wallachia bear the financial burden, offering only a loan to cover its costs. Foreign debt stood at 14 million lei under the occupation, but Știrbei's skilled financial management led the figure to fall to only 1 million lei by 1853.[328] Many of Știrbei's reforms may have had their origins in his pre-revolutionary politics, but the events of 1848 gave new impetus to progress, and Știrbei used that impetus to advance reform in Wallachia.

The Wallachian revolutionaries had attempted to marry the economic future to the political present, but the counterrevolutionary government divorced the two concepts. The Islaz Proclamation was grounded in popular sovereignty. Freedom of speech, association, and the press were all means for the people to enter the public political sphere. They could read and discuss the issues of the day, educate themselves, and become informed citizens. The counterrevolutionary government had no need for informed citizens. It placed restrictions on the movement of people and information to prevent the spread of dissident political ideas, and placed an intellectual quarantine around the principality to divide it from Europe. These restrictions were meant to support the old social order, but they were more sophisticated than anything that preceded the revolution. A counterrevolutionary administrative revolution had replaced the political one of the summer of 1848. It pursued those responsible for the revolution's greatest challenges to the social and geopolitical orders, and it introduced new economic legislation and judicial codes that were meant to undermine popular support for the revolution. Local grievances had become national concerns during the summer. After 1848, they retuned to the localities. All of these initiatives were negotiated between the Wallachian state, its Ottoman Suzerain, and its Russian Protector. Știrbei's reign was interrupted by the Crimean War, but he returned to the Wallachian throne in 1854 and continued to rule until his term expired in 1856. The politics of the succeeding period would be dominated by the returning men of 1848. Știrbei bequeathed them a new administrative state structure. It had emerged in response to the revolutionary upheaval, and it was stronger and more sophisticated than that which preceded it. It could be used for control, and it could be exercised for the cause of progress. The Wallachian revolutionaries had been great believers in progress. The government that followed put progress into practice.

[328] Hitchins, *Romanians,* 275.

Conclusion

In August 1849, the *Düsseldorfer Monatshefte* published a caricature by Ferdinand Schröder. It was titled 'A Panorama of Europe,' and it depicted the various European monarchs and their relationships with the revolutionary events of the era. The Prussian Friedrich Wilhelm IV sweeps revolutionaries from German territory into Switzerland, while Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte stands with his own broom in one hand. His other hands gestures at two boats fleeing west towards America. The Danish King Christian VIII laughs and dances, the Austrian Emperor struggles with a Hungarian while a liberal pulls at his belt, Queen Victoria watches on through her opera glasses from Britain, and Poland is represented by an extinguished candle.[1] Wallachia is nowhere to be seen. It lies beyond the European horizon.

Historians have often adopted Schröder's perspective on Europe when studying the revolution(s) of 1848, but as the preceding five chapters have shown, the Wallachian Revolution had its place in the European constellation, and it can illuminate much about the broader issues at stake during the revolutionary year and after. Wallachian and Moldavian intellectuals—like their Polish and Hungarian contemporaries—imagined Europe from the periphery before the revolution. They cast their national past and future in European terms, and when the revolutionary wave struck the continent, they attempted to reshape their present, too. Ideas about popular sovereignty were connected to questions of personal sovereignty and self-sufficiency that were discussed across Europe. In the urban centres of France, self-sufficiency meant the right to work. In the agrarian context of Wallachia, it meant access to land. The Islaz Proclamation was issued in the name of the Wallachian people, and the revolutionaries sought to include them. The new government did not only speak for the people. It spoke through them in petitions to the Tsar and the Sultan. The people themselves entered the political arena. In Bucharest they formed clubs, attended public meetings, joined processions, and gathered to hear the news of the day from across Europe. In the countryside they swore oaths, listened to the words of propagandists, and used the language and ideology of revolution to articulate local and specific grievances. New spaces of political participation were opened, old spaces appropriated, and new governmental structures introduced to bring Wallachia together. It was a moment defined by a national political culture that was national both in the sense that it was Wallachian and also in that it

[1] Ferdinand Schröders, 'Rundgemälde von Europa', *Düsseldorfer Monatshefte*, August 1849. For a copy of this caricature, see https://www.europa.clio-online.de/quelle/id/q63-28258 [Accessed 04 July 2019].

included the mass of the Wallachian populace. But it wasn't only Wallachian. It was also European. Political modes were borrowed from foreign models, and the specific language of the Wallachian Revolution was adapted from the broader revolutionary lexicon of the mid-nineteenth century.

But the revolutionaries needed foreign support to succeed, and it wasn't forthcoming. Spring brought hope to the liberals and radicals of Europe. The Deputy Mayor of Paris, Philippe Buchez, promised that the revolution would be a work for all Europe, not only Paris or France, and the representatives of the smaller states of Europe rejoiced. They believed in the European unity of peoples, but there were too many causes, and by summer they were fragmenting. Wallachia's envoys abroad continued to appeal to the language and logic of spring, which no longer applied, and they found support hard to come by. Internal politics preoccupied many of the Great Powers, and when minds turned to foreign policy, Italy was the priority. Only the Ottoman and Russian Empires regarded events in Southeastern Europe as a priority. Russia, wrote Alexander Herzen in his *From the Other Shore,* 'fights against the present.'[2] The Wallachian Revolution represented the encroachment of that present into Southeastern Europe, and with the threat of a Russian invasion hanging over the principality, the Ottomans intervened. The two empires would grapple for control of the counterrevolution over the following year. The revolutionaries had sought closer connections with Europe. The counterrevolutionaries provincialised the principality. They cut out political dissent by imposing an informational *cordon sanitaire* around Wallachia, which restricted the movement of people and information. State apparatuses of control expanded. Commissions investigated revolutionary participants and expenditure, decided on compensation for landowners, and weeded out vagabonds from Wallachian society. These new measures of control were accompanied by economic, social, and legal reforms that tightened the grip of the state and reinforced the social order, but also worked to ameliorate the lives of the people. Political revolution would be avoided through economic progress and the localisation of particular grievances.

Writing of the revolution in the German lands in 1848, the historian A.J.P. Taylor described it as a moment when 'history reached its turning-point and failed to turn.'[3] Few would agree with Taylor's assessment now. Debates around the relative failure of the revolution(s) rage on. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Dieter Langewiesche suggested that 1848

[2] Herzen, *From the Other Shore,* 14.
[3] A.J.P. Taylor, *The Course of German History: A Survey of the Development of German History since 1851,* (London: Routledge Classics, 2001), 71.

'laid the foundations on which the political life in the second of the nineteenth century could be built,' and Christopher Clark has argued that the 'revolution in government' that occurred across Europe during the decade after 1848 was both a direct response to the revolution and the work of revolutionaries who reinvented themselves and served the governments that followed.[4] Axel Körner described 1848 in France as a 'reference point for later political movements,' and Maurice Agulhon described it as the 'apprenticeship of the Republic.'[5] The same was true of Wallachia, where many of the revolutionaries would go on to play important roles in the politics of the United Principalities after 1859.

The fall of revolutionary governments led many to despair about Europe's future. Both Victor Hugo and Ion Ghica believed that some form of union was needed to avert a future catastrophe. Smaller-scale regional federations and confederations continued to be debated in the second half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, but these were often marginalised in favour of national unification.[6] The revolutions—plural, not singular—of 1848 would play their part in these processes. As Axel Körner wrote, the commemoration of 1848 transformed a 'European revolution…into many national revolutions.'[7] This trend would continue into the twentieth century. Communist governments in East Germany, Hungary, and Romania all capitalised on the legacy of 1848 and used it to frame their own place in history. In East Germany, 1848 became 'an indisputable element on the revolutionary tradition of the German Democratic Republic,' and in Hungary it served as a substitute for 'the missing revolution in the present.'[8] The Romanian Communist Party even chose to stage the elections of 1948 on the one hundredth anniversary of the Moldavian petition. A walk through present-day Bucharest reveals traces of the revolution everywhere. Streets are named for the outbreak of the Wallachian Revolution in June and its suppression in September. The central boulevard that runs from Piața Romana through Piața Universității to Piața Unirii commemorates Gheorghe Magheru, Nicolae Bălcescu, and Ion C. Brătianu. A small sign near the official residence of the Indonesian Ambassador on Lascăr

---

[4] Haupt, 'European Revolution', 18; Clark, 'After 1848'.
[5] Axel Körner, 'Ideas and Memories of 1848 in France: Nationalism, République Universelle and Internationalism in the Goguette between 1848 and 1890', in Axel Körner ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 85-105, 99; Maurice Agulhon, *1848 ou l'apprentissage de la République.*
[6] See, for instance, the discussions relating to the Balkans and the Caucasus in Berberian, *Roving Revolutionaries,* 106-144 and also Holly Case, 'The Strange Politics of Federative Ideas in East-Central Europe,' *The Journal of Modern History* 85 (2013), 833-866.
[7] Körner, 'The European Dimension', 5.
[8] Quoted in Rapport, *Year of Revolution,* 413; László Péter, 'Old Hats and Closet Revisionists: Reflections on Domokos Kosáry's Latest Work on the 1848 Hungarian Revolution,' *The Slavonic and East European Review* 80 (2002), 296-319, 298.

Catargiu Boulevard still carries the road's name from the Communist era: Ana Ipătescu Boulevard. Other streets are named for C.A. Rosetti and the various revolutionaries of the Golescu family, but two indicators of the international dimension of 1848 survive on the map of the city. One runs alongside the University of Bucharest, and the other is home to the British Embassy. These two streets are named for Edgar Quinet and Jules Michelet. 'After God,' wrote C.A. Rosetti and Ion Brătianu in a letter to Quinet on 8 July 1848, 'it is you, it is Michelet.'[9] The revolution was part of something bigger. It was a European work.

[9] *Anul 1848,* II, 134-135. 'après Dieu, c'est vous, c'est Michelet'

Bibliography

Primary Manuscript Sources

Archives diplomatiques - Centre de Nantes, Nantes (CAD)
166PO/E/168-169

Arhivele Naționale ale României, Bucharest (ANIC)
Comisia Alcătuită pentru cercetarea celor amestecați în fapte revoluționare de la 1848
601/1/1848 - 601/66/1849
Documentele Muntenești 750/XXXIII/1 - 750/XXXIII/35
Paul Bataillard Fond Personal, 1217

Biblioteca Academiei Române, Bucharest (BAR)
Documente Istorice
Fonds Ion Ghica: s 7(1-79)/DCXVI
Manuscrise Românești 3831-3905, 4634, 5029

Bibliotecă Națională a României, Bucharest (BNR)
Fond Bălcescu
Fond Brătianu
Fond Saint-Georges

Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Krakow (BJ)
Berol. Ms. Gall. Fol. 166 [digitised at https://jbc.bj.uj.edu.pl/dlibra/publication/366592/edition/349603/content?ref=desc and accessed 20 March 2019]

The National Archives, Kew (TNA)
Foreign Office Papers, FO78/741-745, FO78/787-789, FO78/828, FO78/864-865

Österreischisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA), Vienna
Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA), Informationsbureau (IB), Actes du Hautes Police, 1849 Bucharest.

Primary Printed Sources

1848 în Principatele Române, Album Apărat sub Îngrijirea Comitetului de Direcție pentru Sârbătorirea Centenarului Anului Revoluționar 1848, (București: Editat de Revista « Arcades », 1948).

Aaron, Florian, *Manual de istoria lumii*, (Bucharest, 1845).

Aricescu, C.D., *Memoriile Mele,* (Bucharest: Profile Publishing, 2002).

Bălcescu, Nicolae, G. Zane ed., *Opere*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne, 1964-1986), 4 vols.

Bellanger, Eugène Stanislas, *Le Kéroutza, Voyage en Moldo-Valachie,* (Paris: Libraire Française et Étrangère, 1846), 2 vols.

Blanc, Louis, *Le Socialisme: Droit au Travail. Réponse a M. Thiers Deuxième Édition,* (Paris: Michel Levy Frères, 1848).

Bratiano, D., *Wallachia and Moldavia: Correspondence of D. Bratiano with Lord Dudley C. Stuart, M.P. on the Danubian Principalities in 1853,* (Manchester: A. Ireland & Co, 1858).

Bratiano, D., *Documents Concerning the Question of the Danubian Principalities dedicated to the English Parliament*, (London: E. Detkens Bookseller, Stationer, &c., 1849).

Brătianu, Ioan C. ed., *Anul 1848 în Principatele Române, Acte și Documente publicate cu ajutorul Comitetului pentru Rădicarea Monumentului*, (Bucharest: Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl, 1902-1910), 6 vols.

[Brătianu, Ion & Armand Lévy], *L'Empereur Napoléon III et Les Principautés Roumains,* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1858).

Broch, Hermann, trans. Willa & Edwin Muir, *The Sleepwalkers: a Trilogy*, (London: Vintage, 1996).
Bucur, Marin ed., *Corespondență C.A. Rosetti: ediție îngrijită, prefață, note și comentarii*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1980).
Bujoreanu, Ioan, *Collectiune de Legiuirile Romaniei vechi și nuoi cate s'au promulgatu pene la finale anului 1870. Legi, Procedure, Regulamente, Decrete, Instructiuni, Formularii, Convențiuni, Concesiuni, Statute, Circulare Instructive, Tablouri & &. Inavutita cu Pravila lui Caragea, legiuirile principelui B.D. Stirbei, Codulu Civilu Vechiu alu Moldovei (Calimach), Manualu de Pravila Bisericească și Statutele Coloniiloru Bulgare din Bassarabia,* (Bucharest, 1873).
Condica Criminală cu Procedura Ei. Întocmită în zilele și prin părinteasca îngrijire a Prea Înălțatului Domn Stăpânitor a toată Țara Românească, Barbu Dimitrie Știrbei, întărită prin luminatul ofis cu No. 1644 din 5 Decembrie 1850, tipărită după înaltă slobozenie prin îngrijirea și cu cheltuiala Pah. Ștefan Burche, (Bucharest: Tipografia lui Iosef Copainir, 1851).
Cornea, Paul & Mihai Zamfir eds., *Gîndirea Românească în epoca pașoptistă* (Bucharest: Editura pentru literature, 1968-1969) 2 vols.
Correspondence Respecting Refugees from Hungary within the Turkish Dominions. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, February 28, 1851. (London: Harrison & Son, 1851).
Curierul Românesc, (Bucharest, 1829-1859).
Dandolo, Enrico, *The Italian volunteers and Lombard Rifle Brigade: being an authentic narrative of the organization, adventures, and final disbanding of these corps, in 1848-1849 / by Emilio Dandolo; translated from the edition published at Turin in 1849; to which are added original letters and important historical documents relating to the late Italian movement of reform,* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851).
Darimon, Alfréd, *Histoire d'un Parti. Les Cinq sous l'Empire, 1857-1860,* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1885).
Dunoyer, Charles-Barthélemy, *L'industrie et la morale considérées dans leurs rapports avec la liberté,* (Paris, 1825).
Flaubert, Gustave, trans. Robert Baldick, *Sentimental Education,* (London: Penguin, 2004).
Foaie pentru Minte, Inimă, și Literatură (Brașov, 1838-1865).
Fotino, George, *Din vremea renașterii naționale a Țării Românești, Boierii Golești*, (Bucharest: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului Imprimeria Națională, 1939), 4 vols.
Fouquier, A., *Annuaire Historique Universel, ou Histoire Politique pour 1848 avec un appendice contenant les actes publics, traités, notes diplomatiques, tableaux statistiques financiers, administratifs et judiciaires, documents historiques officiels et non officiels, et un article Variétés renfermant des chroniques des événements les plus remarquables, des travaux publics, des lettres, des sciences et des arts, et des notices bibliographiques et nécrologiques,* (Paris, 1848).
Georgescu, Vlad ed., *Mémoires et projets de réforme dans les principautés Roumaines 1769-1830,* (Bucharest: Assocation internationale d'études du Sud-Est européen, 1970).
Ghica, Ion, *Amintiri din Pribegia după 1848. Noue Scrisori către V. Alecsandri,* (Bucharest: Editura Librăriei Socec & Comp, 1889).
Ghica, Ion, Ion Roman ed., *Opere,* (Bucharest: Ed. Minerva, 1967-1988), 6 vols.
Guizot, François, *General History of Civilisation in Europe, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution,* (Oxford: D.A. Talboys, 1838), second edition.
Guizot, François, *Histoire Générale de la Civilisation en Europe depuis la chute de l'Empire Romain jusqu'a la Révolution Française,* 3ème édition, (Paris: Didier, 1840).
Hegel, G.W.F., trans. J. Sibree, *Lectures on the Philosophy of History,* (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1861).
Héliade Radulesco, J., *Mémoires sur l'histoire de la régénération roumaine ou sur les événements de 1848 accomplis en Valache*, (Paris: Librairie de la propagande démocratique et sociale européene, 1851).
Heliade Rădulescu, Ion, *Satirele și Fabulele,* (Craiova: Typo-Litographia Națională Ralian Samitca, 1883).

Herzen, Alexander, trans. Moura Budberg & Richard Wollheim, *From the Other Shore & The Russian People and Socialism,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
Hugo, Victor, *Actes et Paroles: Avant l'Exil,* (Paris, 1875), 3 vols.
Kelly, Walter K., *Narrative of the French Revolution of 1848,* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1848).
Kogălniceanu, Mihail, *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie et des Valaques Transdanubiens, Tome Premier. Histoire de la Dacie, des Valaques Transdanubiens et de la Valachie (1241-1792),* (Berlin: Librairie de B. Behr, 13, Oberwallstrasse, 1837).
Kogălniceanu, Mihail, Dan Simonescu ed., *Opere*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974-1989), 5 vols.
Kogalnitchan, Michel de, *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les mœurs et la langue des Cigains, connus en France sous le nom de Bohémiens suivie d'un recueil de sept cents mots Cigains,* (Berlin: Librairie de B. Behr, 1837).
Lăcusteanu, Grigore, *Amintirile Colonelului Lăcusteanu*, (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2015).
Le Constitutionnel, (Paris, 1819-1914).
Lewald, Fanny, trans. Hanna Ballin Lewis, *A Year of Revolutions: Fanny Lewald's Recollections of 1848*, (Oxford: Berghahn, 1997).
L'Illustration, (Paris, 1843-1944).
Livius, Titus, *The History of Rome*.
MacCabe, William Bernard, *A True Account of the Hungarian Revolution; Its Purposes and Pretences: by An American Diplomat. With Preliminary Observations, Respecting the Liberals Abroad and the Liberal Party at Home. Especially Intended for the Perusal of Roman Catholics,* (London: Richardson and Son, 1851).
Magazinu Istoricu pentru Dacia, (Bucharest, 1845-1847), 5 vols.
Manchester Guardian, (Manchester, 1828-1959).
Maior, Petru, *Istoria pentru Începutul Românilor în Dacia,* (Buda, 1812).
Marx, Karl, trans. Ben Fowkes, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, (London: Penguin, 2004), 3 vols.
Men of the Time: A Dictionary of Contemporaries, containing biographical notices of Eminent Characters of Both Sexes, (London: Routledge and Sons, 1868), seventh edition.
Michelet, Jules, *Légendes Démocratiques du Nord,* (Paris: Garnier Frères, Rue des Saints-Pères, 6, 1854).
Mickiewicz, Adam, trans. Krystyn Lach-Szyrma, *The Books and the Pilgrimage of the Polish Nation,* (London: James Ridgway, 1833).
Miller Madden, Henry ed., 'The Diary of John Paget, 1849', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 19 (1939-1940), 237-264.
Noyes, James O., *Roumania: The Border Land of the Christian and the Turk, Comprising Adventures or Travels in Eastern Europe and Western Asia*, (New York: Rudd & Carleton, 1857).
Pascu, Ștefan & Iosif Pervain eds., *George Barițiși contemporanii săi*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1973-), 8 vols.
Pippidi, Andrei, 'Repatrierea exilaților după revoluția din 1848 din Țara Românească', *Revista Arhivelor* 2 (2008), 328-362.
Potra, George ed., *Documente privitoare la Istoria Orașului București 1821-1848,* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975).
Regnault, Élias, *Histoire Politique et Sociale des Principautés Danubiennes,* (Paris: Paulin et le Chevalier, 1855).
Regnault, Élias, *La Question Européenne improprement appelée Polonaise. Réponse aux objections présentées par Mm. Pogodine, Schédo-Ferroti, Porochine, Schnitzler, Solowiew, etc. contre le Polonisme des Provinces Lithuano-Ruthènes et contre le non-Slavisme des Moscovites,* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1863).
Regulamentul Organic întrupat cu legiurile din anii 1831, 1832 și 1833, și adăogat la sfârșit cu legiurile de la anul 1834 până acum, împărțită pe fie-care an, precum și cu o scară deslușită a materiilor. Acum a

doa oară tipărit cu slobozenia Înaltei Stăpâniri în zilele prea înălțatului Prinț și Domn Stăpânitor a toată Țara Românească, Gheorghie D. Bibescu BB, (Bucharest, 1847).
Saint-Simon, Henri de, *De la réorganisation de la société Européenne ou de la nécessité et des moyens de rassembler les peuples de l'Europe en un seul corps politique, en conservant a chacun son indépendance nationale,* (Paris, 1814).
St. John, Percy B., *French Revolution of 1848. The Three Days of February 1848*, (London: Richard Bentley, 1848), second edition.
Sauer, George, *The Telegraph in Europe. A Complete Statement of the Rise and Progress of Telegraphy in Europe, Showing the Cost of Construction and Working Expenses of Telegraphic Communications in the Principal Countries etc. etc.,* (Paris, 1869).
Shaw, Stanford J. & Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey Volume 2: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey 1808-1975*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
Sièyes, Emmanuel Joseph, *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers-État?*, (Paris, 1789).
Skene, J.H., *The Danubian Principalities, The Frontier Lands of the Christian and the Turk. By a British Resident of Twenty Years in the East*, (London: Richard Bentley, 1854), third edition, 2 vols.
Stahl, Friedrich Julius, 'What is the Revolution?' [1852], in Jonathan Sperber ed., *From Vörmarz to Prussian Dominance, 1815-1866,* [http://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/4_P_O_Stahl_What is the Revolution.pdf accessed 15 May 2019]Tocqueville, Alexis de, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, Jon Elster ed., *The Ancien Régime and the French Revolution,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
Varta, Ion, *Revoluția de la 1848 în Țările Române: documente inedite din arhivele rusești,* (Chișinau: Editura ARC, 1998).
Wilkinson, William, *An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia: with Various Political Observations Relating to Them*, (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1820).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Achim, Venera, 'Emanciparea țiganilor și programul legislative al guvernului provizoriu din 1848', *Revista Istorică*, XX (2009), 63-72.
Achim, Viorel, Richard Davies trans., *The Roma in Romanian History*, (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004).
Agnès, Benoît, 'Le « Pétitionnaire Universel » : Les Normes de la Pétition en France et au Royaume-Uni pendant la première moitie du XIX^{e} Siècle', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 58 (2011), 45-70.
Agulhon, Maurice, *1848 ou l'apprentissage de la République, 1848-1852,* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1973).
Agulhon, Maurice, trans. Janet Lloyd, *Marianne into Battle: Republican Imagery and Symbolism in France 1789-1880*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
Agulhon, Maurice, trans. Janet Lloyd, *The Republican Experiment, 1848-1852,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
Amann, Peter H., *Revolution and Mass Democracy: The Paris Club of 1848*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975).
Ananich, Boris, 'The Russian economy and banking system', in Dominic Lieven ed., *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume II: Imperial Russia, 1689-1917*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 394-426.
Ardeleanu, Constantin, 'A British Meat Cannery in Moldavia (1844-1852)', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 90 (2012), 671-704.

Ardeleanu, Constantin, 'Danube Navigation and the Danube-Black Sea Canal (1830-1856)', *Revista Istorică*, XXIII (2012), 415-431.
Ardeleanu, Constantin, *International Trade and Diplomacy at the Lower Danube: The Sulina Question and the Economic Premises of the Crimean War (1829-1853),* (Brăila: Editura Istros, 2014).
Baár, Monika, *Historians and Nationalism: East-Central Europe in the Nineteenth Century,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
Balan, Dinu, *Național, naționalism, xenofobie și antisemitism în societatea românească modernă*, (Iași: Ed. Junimea, 2006).
Baranyi, George, *Stephen Széchenyi and the awakening of Hungarian nationalism, 1791-1841,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968).
Barbu, Paul, 'Ioan Maiorescu - Activitatea sa politică și diplomatică (1848-1859) ', *Revista de Istorie*, 41 (1988), 419-436.
Beales, Derek & Eugenio Biagini, *Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy,* (London: Pearson, 2002), 2nd edn.
Bell, David A., *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).
Berberian, Houri, *Roving Revolutionaries: Armenians and the Connected Revolutions in the Russian, Iranian, and Ottoman Worlds,* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019).
Berdahl, Robert M., *The Politics of the Prussian Nobility: The Development of a Conservative Ideology, 1770-1848*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988).
Berger, Helge & Mark Spoerer, 'Economic Crises and the European Revolutions of 1848', *The Journal of Economic History*, 61.2 (2001), 293-326.
Berindei, Dan, 'Review of Dan V. Pleshoyano, *Colonel Nicolae Pleșoianu and the National Regeneration Movement in Walachia,' European History Quarterly* 23 (1993), 300-301.
Berindei, Dan, *Revoluția Română din 1848-1849: considerații și reflexii,* (Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 1997).
Berindei, Dan, 'Revoluționarii români de la 1848 și mișcarea democratică și socialistă din Europa', *Revista de Istorie*, 28 (1975), 1387-1399.
Bitis, Alexander, *Russia and the Eastern Question: Army, Government, and Society: 1815-1833,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
Bloch, Ernst, trans. Mark Ritter, 'Nonsynchronism and the Obligation to its Dialectics', *New German Critique* 11 (1977), 22-38.
Bodea, Cornelia, *Lupta românilor pentru unitatea națională, 1834-1849*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1967).
Bodea, Cornelia, trans. Liliana Teodoreanu, *The Romanians' Struggle for unification 1834-1849*, (Bucharest: Pub. House of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, 1970).
Boïtos, Olimpiu, 'Paul Bataillard, un ami oublié d'Edgar Quinet: Quelques lettres inédites de Quinet', *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 39 (1932), 204-235.
Brett, Annabel, *Changes of State: Nature and the Limits of the City in Early Modern Natural Law,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011).
Breuilly, John, 'On the principle of nationality', in Gareth Stedman Jones & Gregory Claeys eds., *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Political Thought,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 77-109.
Brisku, Adrian, *Political Reform in the Ottoman and Russian Empires: A Comparative Approach,* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017).
Campbell, John C., *French Influence and the Rise of Roumanian Nationalism*, (New York: Arno Press, 1971).
Case, Holly, *The Age of Questions Or, A First Attempt at an Aggregate History of the Eastern, Social, Woman, American, Jewish Polish, Bullion, Tuberculosis, and Many Other Questions over the Nineteenth Century, and Beyond,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018).

Case, Holly, 'Being European: East and West', in Jeffrey T. Checkel & Peter J. Katzenstein eds., *European Identity,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 111-131.
Case, Holly, *Between States: The Transylvanian Question and the European Idea during World War II,* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009).
Case, Holly, 'The Strange Politics of Federative Ideas in East-Central Europe,' *The Journal of Modern History* 85 (2013), 833-866.
Căzănișteanu, Constantin, 'În legătură cu drapelele instituite în timpul revoluției muntene de la 1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie* IV (1966), 265-272.
Căzănișteanu, Constantin & Apostol Stan, 'Refugiați Transilvăneni în timpul revoluției de la 1848-1849 în Țara Românească', *Studii*, 23 (1970), 501-519.
Ceaușu, Mihai-Ștefan & Dumitru Vitcu, 'Romanian Emigration and the Epilogue of the 1848 Revolution', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XLIII (2004), 89-109.
Ciobanu, Veniamin, *Relațiile politice româno-polone între 1699 și 1848*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1980).
Clark, Christopher, 'After 1848: The European Revolution in Government', *Transactions of the RHS*, 22 (2012), 171-197.
Clark, Christopher, *Time and Power: Visions of History in German Politics, from the Thirty Years' War to the Third Reich,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019).
Clark, T.J., *The Absolute Bourgeois, Artists and Politics in France 1848-1851,* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1982).
Corfus, Ilie, *Agricultura Țării Românești în prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea,* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1969).
Corfus, Ilie, *Agricultura în Țările Române, 1848-1864: Istorie Agrară Comparată,* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1982).
Cosma, Mihaila, 'Refugiați Transilvani în Muntenia la 1849', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițiu* XL (2001), 291-302.
Costinescu, Mariana & Petre Costinescu eds., *Propășirea: foaie științifică și literatură/studiu introductiv, note și comentarii de Paul Cornea*, (Bucharest: Minerva, 1980).
Cristache-Panait, Ioana, 'Unele probleme privind situația din București după 13 septembrie 1848', *Studii*, 16 (1963), 887-902.
Cristian, Vasile, 'Cerințele luptei naționale românești din preajma anului 1848 și reflectarea lor în tematica scrierilor istorice', in Nicolae Edroiu et al. eds., *Stat, Societate, Națiune. Interpretări Istorice*, (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia Cluj-Napoca, 1982).
Cristian, Vasile, *Contribuția istoriografiei la pregătirea ideologică a revoluției române de la 1848*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1985).
Cristian, Vasile, *Istoriografia pașoptistă*, (Iași: Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza, 1996).
Déak, István, 'Lajos Kossuth's Nationalism and Internationalism', *Austrian History Yearbook* 12 (1976), 48-52.
Delureanu, Ștefan, 'Românii și "Germania" adunări naționale de la Frankfurt', *Revista Istorică*, IV (1993), 965-998.
Diculescu, Vladimir, *Bresle, negustori, și meseriași în Țara Românească (1830-1848)*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1973).
Dijn, Annelien de, *French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville: Liberty in a Levelled Society?,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
Dogaru, Maria, 'Tricolorul și cocardele în contextual luptei revoluționarilor pașoptiști', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 861-869.
Dowe, Dieter et al. eds, trans. David Higgins, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2000).

Drace-Francis, Alex, 'Dinicu Golescu's *Account of My Travels* (1826): Eurotopia as Manifesto', in Wendy Bracewell & Alex Drace-Francis eds., *Balkan Departures: Travel Writing from Southeastern Europe,* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 47-74.
Drace-Francis, Alex, *The Making of Modern Romanian Culture: Literacy and the Development of National Identity*, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005).
Emerit, Marcel, *Les Paysans Roumains depuis le traité d'Adrinople jusqu'à la liberation des terres (1829-1864),* (Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1937).
Evans, Richard J., 'Epidemics and Revolutions: Cholera in Nineteenth-Century Europe', *Past & Present* 120 (1988), 123-146.
Evans, Richard J., *The Pursuit of Power, Europe 1815-1914,* (London: Allen Lane, 2016).
Evans, R.J.W. and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds, *The Revolutions in Europe 1848-1849: From Reform to Reaction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
Fasel, George, 'The Wrong Revolution: French Republicanism in 1848', *French Historical Studies*, 8.4 (1974), 654-677, 669.
Florescu, Radu R., *The Struggle Against Russia in the Romanian Principalities: A Problem in Anglo-Turkish Diplomacy, 1821-1854,* (Iași: The Center for Romanian Studies, 1997).
Fritzsche, Peter, *Stranded in the Present, Modern Time and the Melancholy of History*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).
Frunzetti, Ion, *Pictori Revoluționari de la 1848,* (București: Editura Meridiane, 1988).
Gallaher, John G., *The Students of Paris and the Revolution of 1848*, (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980).
Garoafă, Dumitru, 'Refugiați Transilvăneni în județul Vâlcea în timpul revoluției de la 1848-1849', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițˌ* XL (2001), 79-85.
Georgescu, Florian, 'Aspecte privind împărțirea administrativă și evoluția demografică din București anilor 1831-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, III (1966), 53-88.
Georgescu, Florian, 'Focul cel Mare din Martie 1847', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie* VII (1969), 55-66.
Georgescu, Florian et al. eds., *Istoria Orașului București*, (Bucharest: Muzeul de Istorie a Orașului București, 1965).
Georgescu, Florian, 'Probleme de urbanism și sistematizare în București în anii 1831-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie* IV (1966), 35-68.
Georgescu, Florian, 'Realizări edilitare în Bucureștii anilor 1831-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, IV (1966), 87-122.
Georgescu, Vlad, *Political Ideas and the Enlightenment in the Romanian Principalities, 1750-1830*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971).
Ginsborg, Paul, *Daniele Manin and the Venetian Republic of 1848-1849,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
Ginsborg, Paul, 'Peasants and Revolutionaries in Venice and the Veneto, 1848', *The Historical Journal* XVII (1974), 503-550.
Giurescu, Constantin C., *Contribuțiuni la studiul originilor și dezvoltării burgheziei române pînă la 1848*, (Bucharest: Editura științifică, 1972).
Giurescu, Constantin, *Istoria Bucureștilor din cele mai vechi timpuri pînă în zilele noastre,* (București: Editura pentru Literatură, 1966).
Gray, Robert W., 'Bringing the Law Back In: Law and the Hungarian Peasantry before 1848', *The Slavonic and East European Review,* 91 (2013), 511-534.
Gray, Robert William Benjamin, *Land Reform and the Hungarian Peasantry c. 1700-1848,* (PhD Thesis, University College London, 2009). [Available at http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/19321/1/19321.pdf and accessed 14 April 2019].
Green, Abigail, 'Intervening in the Public Sphere: German Governments and the Press, 1815-1870', *The Historical Journal*, 44.1 (2001), 155-175.

Hagen, William W., *Ordinary Prussians: Brandenburg Junkers and villagers, 1500-1840*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
Harre, Angela, 'The Concept of *Progress:* The Fraught Relation between Liberalism and State Intervention', in Victor Neumann & Armin Heinen eds., *Key Concepts of Romanian History: Alternative Approaches to Socio-Political Language,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2013), 153-182.
Harsin, Jill, *Barricades: The War of the Streets in Revolutionary Paris, 1830-1848,* (New York: Palgrave, 2002).
Hearder, Harry, *Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento, 1790-1870,* (Harlow: Longman, 1983).
Hen-Konarski, Tomasz, 'No Longer just Peasants and Priests: The Most Recent Studies on Nation Building in Nineteenth-Century Ukraine', *European History Quarterly* 45 (2015), 713-737.
Hitchins, Keith, *Orthodoxy and Nationality: Andreiu Șaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania, 1846-1873*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977).
Hitchins, Keith, 'Romanian Liberalism (1821-1866)', in Victor Neumann & Armin Heinen eds., *Key Concepts of Romanian History: Alternative Approaches to Socio-Political Language,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2013), 107-130.
Hitchins, Keith, *The Romanians, 1774-1866*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
Hitchins, Keith, *The Rumanian national movement in Transylvania, 1780-1849*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1969).
Holt, Mack P., *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), second edition.
Hroch, Miroslav, trans. Ben Fowkes, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
Iacob, Dan Dumitru, *Elitele din Principatele Române în Prima Jumătate a Secolului al XIX-lea: Sociabilitate și Divertisment*, (Iași: Editura Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, 2015).
Ionescu, Adrian-Silvan, 'Momentul 1848 în plastica documentaristă', *Revista Istorică*, XV (1999), 501-518.
Ionescu, Gh. T., 'Noi mărturii despre Ana Ipatescu', *Revista de Istorie*, 28 (1975), 329-344.
Ionescu, Traian, 'Activitatea consulatelor franceze din principatele române în timpul revoluției de la 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 809-834.
Ionescu, Traian, 'Misiunea lui Al. Gh. Golescu la Paris în 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 27 (1974), 1727-1746.
Iordache, Anastasie, *Goleștii: locul și rolul lor în istoria României*, (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1979).
Iordache, Anastasie, *Principatele Române în epoca modernă*, (Bucharest: Albatros, 1996-), 2 vols.
Iorga, Nicolae, *Viața și Domnia lui Barbu Dimitrie Știrbei, Domn al Țerii-Românești (1849-1856),* (Vălenii-de-Munte: Neamul Românesc, 1910).
Isar, Nicolae, *Din istoria generației de la 1848 - Revoluție, exil, destin istoric,* (Bucharest: Editura Universitară, 2006).
Isar, Nicolae, *Publiciști francezi și cauza română*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1991).
Iscru, G.D., *Revoluția română din 1848-1849,* (Bucharest: Casa de Editură și Librărie N. Bălcescu, 1997).
Isser, Natalie, *The Second Empire and the Press: A Study of Government-inspired Brochures on French Foreign Policy in their Propaganda Milieu,* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974),
Jedlicki, Jerzy, *A Suburb of Europe: Nineteenth-century Polish Approaches to Western Civilization,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1999).
Jelavich, Barbara, *Russia and the Formation of the Romanian National State, 1821-1878*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Jelavich, Barbara, 'The Russian Intervention in Wallachia and Transylvania, September 1848 to March 1849', *Rumanian Studies: An International Annual of Humanities and Social Sciences* IV (1979), 16-74.
Jennings, Lawrence C., *France and Europe in 1848: A Study of French Foreign Affairs in Time of Crisis,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).
Jianu, Angela, *A Circle of Friends: Romanian Revolutionaries and Political Exile, 1840-1859,* (Leiden, NL: Brill Balkan Studies Library, 2012).
Johnston, Jean-Michel, 'The Time and the Place to Network: Werner Siemens during the Era of Prussian Industrialization, 1835-1846', *Central European History* 50 (2017), 160-183.
Jones, P.M. *Reform and Revolution in France: The Politics of Transition, 1774-1791,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
Jordan, David P. 'Haussmann and *Haussmannisation:* The Legacy for Paris', *French Historical Studies* 27.1 (2004), 87-113
Jørgensen, Claus Møller, 'Transurban interconnectivities: an essay on the interpretation of the revolutions of 1848', *European Review of History - Revue européenne d'histoire*, 19.2, (2012), 201-227.
Judson, Pieter M., *The Habsburg Empire, A New History*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016).
Kelly, Aileen M., *The Discovery of Chance: The Life and Thought of Alexander Herzen,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016).
King, Charles, 'Imagining Circassia: David Urquhart and the Making of North Caucasus Nationalism', *The Russian Review* 66 (2007), 238-255.
Knights, Mark, 'London's "Monster" Petition of 1680', *The Historical Journal* 36 (1993), 39-67.
Knights, Mark, '"The Lowest Degree of Freedom": The Right to Petition Parliament, 1640-1800', *Parliamentary History* 37 (2018), 18-34.
Körner, Axel ed., *1848: A European Revolution? International Ideas and National Memories of 1848*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000).
Koselleck, Reinhart, trans. Keith Tribe, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).
Kramer, Lloyd S., *Threshold of a New World: Intellectuals and the Exile Experience in Paris, 1830-1848,* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).
Kukiel, Marian, *Czartoryski and European Unity,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955).
Kuykendell, Ronald, 'Hegel and Africa: An Evaluation of the Treatment of Africa in The Philosophy of History', *Journal of Black Studies,* 23 (1993), 571-581.
Leith, J.A., *Space and Revolution: Projects for Monuments, Squares, and Public Buildings in France, 1789-1899,* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991).
Liu, Nicolae, 'Mentalite revoluționară și cultură modernă: Contacte și consonanțe româno-franceze la 1848', *Revista Istorică*, IV (1993), 999-1014.
Loft, Philip, 'Involving the Public: Parliament, Petitioning, and the Language of Interest, 1688-1720', *Journal of British Studies* 55 (2016), 1-23.
Maciu, Vasile, 'Ion Heliade Rădulescu in the Romanian Revolution of 1848', *Southeastern Europe* 6 (1979), 46-58.
Marinescu, Beatrice, 'Evenimentele politice postrevoluționare din principatele române în perspectiva rapoartelor diplomatice engleze (1849-1953) ', *Revista Istorică*, IV (1993), 1015-1034.
Maxwell, Alexander & Alexander Campbell, 'István Széchenyi, the casino movement, and Hungarian nationalism, 1827-1848', *Nationalities Papers* 42 (2014), 508-526.
McPhee, Peter, *The Politics of Rural Life: Political Mobilization in the French Countryside 1846-1852*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Mihalache, Cătălina & Leonidas Rados eds, *Educația publică și condiționările sale (secolele XIX-XX)*, (Iași: Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza, 2015).
Mintzker, Yair, *The Defortification of the German City, 1699-1866,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
Miskolczy, Ambrus, 'The Dialogue among Hungarian and Romanian Exiles in 1850-1851', in Ignác Romsics & Béla K. Király eds., *Geopolitics in the Danube Region: Hungarian Reconciliation Efforts, 1848-1998,* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1999), 99-129.
Moggach, Douglas & Gareth Stedman Jones eds, *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
Moisil, Constantin, 'Problema monetară în Țara Românească în anii 1848-1849', *Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române* 19 (1924), 27-37 & 59-95.
Mooser, Josef, 'Property and Wood Theft: Agrarian Capitalism and Social Conflict in Rural Society, 1800-1850. A Westphalian Case Study' in Robert G. Moeller ed., *Peasants and Lords in Modern Germany: Recent Studies in Agricultural History,* (London: Routledge, 1986), 52-80.
Mudure, Mihaela, 'Blackening Gypsy Slavery: The Romanian Case', in Heike Raphael-Hernandez ed., *Blackening Europe: the African American presence*, (London: Routledge, 2004), 263-283.
Namier, Lewis, *1848: The Revolution of the Intellectuals,* (London: Oxford University Press, 1946).
Neamțu, Gelu, 'Gazeta de Transilvania în revoluția de la 1848-1849', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițiu* XXXV (1996), 132-159.
Neamțu, Gelu, 'Maghiari alături de revoluția română de la 1848-1849 din Transilvania', *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițiu din Cluj-Napoca* XLI (2002), 97-126.
Olteanu, Constantin, 'Concepția conducătorilor revoluționari pașoptiști din țările române cu privire la puterea armată', *Revista de Istorie*, 32 (1979), 1055-1068.
Oncescu, Iulian, 'Les Polonais et les Roumains et leur rôle dans la transformation de la cause nationale en problème européen (1830-1866)', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, XLVIII (2009), 181-193.
Panait, Ioana & P.I. Panait, 'Participarea maselor populare din București la înfrîngerea comploturilor reacțiunii din iunie 1848', *Studii*, 13.6 (1960), 83-98.
Panaite, Viorel, 'The Legal and Political Status of Wallachia and Moldavia in relation to the Ottoman Porte,' in Gábor Kármán and Lovro Kunčević, *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 9-42.
Panaitescu, P.P., *Contribuții la o Biografia a lui N. Bălcescu,* (București: Tip. Convorbiri Literare Strada Câmpineanu No. 17, 1923).
Patriarca, Silvana, *Numbers and Nationhood: Writing Statistics in nineteenth-century Italy,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
Péter, László, 'Old Hats and Closet Revisionists: Reflections on Domokos Kosáry's Latest Work on the 1848 Hungarian Revolution,' *The Slavonic and East European Review* 80 (2002), 296-319, 298.
Petrașcu, N., *Vasile Alecsandri, Studiu Critice*, (București: Grafic I.V. Socecu, 1894).
Petrescu, Ileana, 'Între revoluția de la 1821 și revoluția de la 1848', in Titu Georgescu et al. eds., *Istoria Craiovei,* (Craiova: Scrisul Românesc, 1977), 42-56.
Pickering, Paul, '"And Your Petitioners &c": Chartist Petitioning in Popular Politics 1838-48,' *English Historical Review* 116 (2001), 368-388.
Pickering, Paul, 'Class without Words: Symbolic Communication in the Chartist Movement', *Past & Present* 112 (1986), 144-162.
Pitts, Jennifer, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

Platon, Gheorghe, 'L'Europe et la révolution roumaine de 1848', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXVII (1998), 73-88.
Platon, Gheorghe, *Geneza revoluției Române de la 1848: introducere in istoria moderna a României*, (Iași: Editura Junimea, 1980).
Pleshoyano, Dan V., trans. Kathe Lieber, *Colonel Nicolae Pleșoianu and the National Regeneration Movement in Walachia*, (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1991).
Plokhy, Serhii M., 'The History of a "Non-historical" Nation: Notes on the Nature and Current Problems of Ukrainian Historiography', *Slavic Review* 54 (1995), 709-716.
Popa, Ion, 'Elemente de teoria istoriei la Nicolae Bălcescu și dimensiunea lor europeană', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 793-808.
Popa, Petre et al., *Istoria Municipiului Pitești*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1988).
Procyk, Anna, 'Polish Émigrés as Emissaries of the "Risorgimento" in Eastern Europe', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 25 (2001), 7-30.
Rapport, Mike, *1848: Year of Revolution*, (London: Abacus, 2009).
Rezachevici, Constantin & Valeriu Stan, 'Memoriile istorice ale colonelului Ion Voinescu I, un izvor inedit privitor la istoria politică a veacului al XIX-lea. Fragmente referitoare la revoluția de la 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 835-849.
Riall, Lucy, *The Italian Risorgimento: State, Society, and National Unification,* (London: Routledge, 1994).
Roateș, Florian, 'Interferențe europene în gîndiriea istorică Românească de la 1848', *Revista Istorică*, I (1990), 73-82.
Roberts, Ian W., *Nicholas I and the Russian intervention in Hungary*, (London: Macmillan, 1991).
Roman, Nicoleta, 'Prostituția în orașele Țării Românești (1829-1859) ', *Revista Istorică*, XX (2009), 277-290.
Roșu, Victor-Tudor, 'A.T. Laurian, editor și redactor la *Magazin istoric pentru Dacia*', *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica* 13 (2009), 125-145.
Roșu, Victor-Tudor, 'Concepție și metodă istorică la August Treboniu Laurian. Episodul *Magazinului istoric pentru Dacia*', *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica* 9 (2005), 65-82.
Samuels, Maurice, *The Right to Difference: French Universalism and the Jews*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).
Scafeș, Cornel I. & Vladimir Zodian, *Barbu Știrbei (1849-1865)*, (Bucharest: Editura militară, 1981).
Schama, Simon, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution,* (London: Penguin Books, 1989).
Sewell, William H., *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
Simić, Andrei, *The Peasant Urbanites: A Study of Rural-Urban Mobility in Serbia*, (New York: Seminar Press, 1973).
Simon, Walter M., 'History for Utopia: Saint-Simon and the Idea of Progress,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 17 (1956), 311-331.
Sorescu, Andrei-Dan, 'National History as a History of Compacts Jus Publicum Europaeum and Suzerainty in Romania in the Mid-Nineteenth Century,' *East Central Europe* 45(1) (2018), 63-93.
Sperber, Jonathan, *The European Revolutions, 1848-1849*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), second edition.
Stan, Apostol, 'Arendășia în Țara Românească în epoca regulamentară (1831-1848) Aspecte social-economice', *Studii*, 20 (1967), 1177-1197.
Stan, Apostol, 'Elemente de modernitate ale agriculturii românești, 1831-1864', *Revista Istorică*, II (1991), 369-381.

Stan, A., 'Încercări de organizare a unei rezistențe armate în timpul revoluției muntene de la 1848', *Studii*, 16 (1963), 621-642.
Stan, Apostol, 'Lajos Kossuth and the Romanians during the 1848 Revolution', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXIII (1994), 355-374.
Stan, Apostol, 'Propaganda revoluționară la sate în revoluția de la 1848 din Țara Românească', *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (1978), 769-791.
Stan, Apostol, *Revoluția română de la 1848: solidaritate și unitate națională*, (Bucharest: Editura politică, 1987).
Stan, Apostol, 'Revoluție și legalitate în 1848 în principatele române', *Revista Istorică*, IX (1998), 373-380.
Stan, Apostol, 'Revolution and legality in the Romanian Principalities in 1848', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXVII (1998), 105-111.
Stan, Apostol, 'Unitatea națională prin legături între cărturari în anii anteriori revoluției de la 1848', *Revista de Istorie*, 41 (1988), 386-403.
Stan, Apostol, 'L'unité nationale chez les Roumains en 1848: idée et action politiques', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* XXXII (1993), 15-33.
Stan, Valeriu, trans. Delia Răzolescu, *Nicolae Bălcescu, 1819-1852*, (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1977).
Stănculescu, Florea, 'Idei social-politice în gîndirea și activitatea lui Aron Florian', *Revista de Istorie*, 28 (1975), 1171-1182.
Ștefan, I.M., *Ana Ipătescu,* (București: Editura Militară, 1975).
Sută-Selejan, Sultana, *Gîndirea economică a lui Nicolae Bălcescu*, (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1967).
Tappe, E.D., 'A Bible Society Agent in the Rumanian Principalities', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 42.99 (1964), 388-402.
Taylor, A.J.P., *The Course of German History: A Survey of the Development of German History since 1851,* (London: Routledge Classics, 2001).
Taylor, Miles, 'The 1848 Revolutions and the British Empire', *Past & Present* 166 (2000), 146-180.
Todorova, Maria, 'The Trap of Backwardness: Modernity, Temporality, and the Study of Eastern European Nationalism', *Slavic Review* 64.1, (2005), 140-164.
Tomi, Raluca, 'Imigrația italiană în spațiul românesc: Italienii din Brăila (1834-1876) ', *Revista Istorică*, XVIII (2007), 497-517.
Tomi, Raluca, 'Mișcarea aboliționistă din principateși impactul ei asupra legislației de dezrobire (1849-1856)', *Revista Istorică* XXI (2010), 57-71.
Tóth, Heléna, *An Exiled Generation: German and Hungarian Refugees of Revolution, 1848-1871,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
Totu, Maria, 'Participarea românilor din Transilvania la revoluția de la 1848 în Țara Românească', *Revista de Istorie*, 29 (1976), 841-864.
Traugott, Mark, *Armies of the Poor: Determinants of Working-Class Participation in the Parisian Insurrection of June,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985).
Traugott, Mark, *The Insurgent Barricade,* ((Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2010).
Vick, Brian E., *Defining Germany: The 1848 Frankfurt Parliament and National Identity,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
Vintilă-Ghițulescu, Constanța, *Patimă și Desfătare, Despre lucrurile mărunte ale vieții cotidiene în societatia românească (1750-1860)*, (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2015).
Vlad, Laurențiu, 'Scurte note cu privire la cenzura din Țara Românească: Două episoade din biografia lui Constantin N. Brăiloiu (1849-1850, 1858)', *Analele Universității București,* 4 (2002), 33-42.

Wade Martins, Susanna, *The English model farm: building the agricultural ideal, 1700-1914*, (Macclesfield: Windgather, 2002).
Weinberg, I., 'Franz Liszt și Iohann Strauss în București anilor 1847-1848', *Materiale de Istorie și Muzeografie*, IV (1966), 369-378.
Werner, Michael & Bénédicte Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity,' *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 30-50.
Wolff, Larry, *The Idea of Galicia: History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture,* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010).
Wolff, Larry, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment,* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994).
Wulf, Andrea, *The Invention of Nature: The Adventures of Alexander von Humboldt, the Lost Hero of Science*, (London: John Murray, 2015), 235-248.